

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 5179. A bill to extend for 3 years the temporary additional pay for equipment maintenance for each carrier in Rural Mail Delivery Service provided for by the act of December 17, 1943; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 5180. A bill to provide for the donation by the United States of the site of the original Fort Buford, N. Dak., to the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARTER:

H. R. 5181. A bill to provide a method for compensating certain individuals for damages sustained as the result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 5182. A bill creating an office of military research and development in the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. D'ALESSANDRO:

H. R. 5183. A bill to provide for the establishment of a modern, adequate, and efficient hospital center in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 5184. A bill to extend the operation of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5985. By Mr. BUCKLEY: Petition of J. M. Cotton and 87 others protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5986. By Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Petition of Franklin County, Mo., citizens, protesting against any form of prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5987. By Mr. GAMBLE: Petition of sundry residents of Westchester County, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of any prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, AUGUST 15, 1944

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in a world so hedged about with mystery beyond the ken of our peering eyes, we thank Thee for the revelation of Thyself in the majestic order of the universe in which we live, in the emancipating truth which exploring minds discover, and, above all, in the grandeur of spiritual verities which mock our unbelief as we touch life at its highest and best in the noblest sons of men. Set our feet on lofty places. In baffling days give us the vision and the wisdom to help fashion a world worthy of the martyred dead whose lifeblood is the price of redemption from the black evil threatening all that is fair and fine upon the earth. Grant us the grace of

penitence for all in our own hearts and in our own land which betrays and denies the creed of freedom we profess. In this dark night of the world's agony in an hour of human destiny Thou hast set us to play our part on a high hill that cannot be hid. Make our lives as lighted candles on the altar of Thy eternal purpose for all mankind.

We ask it in the name of the Prince of Peace, who is the one true light, and to whose radiant kingdom of love there is no frontier. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, August 11, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, revised estimates of personnel requirements for certain bureaus and divisions of the Department for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1945 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, revised estimates of personnel requirements affecting certain administrations, bureaus, and offices of the Department, requests for which were made during the period April 1, 1943, through June 30, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

REPORT OF BOARD OF ACTUARIES OF THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the twenty-third annual report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Toledo, Ohio, favoring the prompt enactment of House bill 4915, the so-called post-war highway-construction bill, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

PROGRAM OF POST-WAR HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, since the introduction of H. R. 4915, the so-called Federal highway bill, I have received a tremendous number of communications from all parts of the State of Pennsylvania. These communications are unanimous in urging that early action be taken on this bill in order that the several States may be informed fully regarding the proposed program of the Federal Government and the requirements which

will be laid down in that program with respect to State participation.

Indicative of the many requests which I have received is a telegram from Mr. Robert Y. Burns, president of the Erie County Motor Club, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

I also ask, Mr. President, that the telegram be referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. I urge that the committee take early action on the pending bill in order that a sound program may be developed at the earliest possible moment.

I am convinced that we must develop a program which will insure a complete and cordial cooperation between the Federal Government and the governments of the various States in the execution of post-war highway projects. Such a program, it will be readily admitted, will be one of the foremost needs of the Nation in the early post-war years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the telegram presented by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The telegram was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, as follows:

ERIE, PA., August 14, 1944.

Hon. J. J. DAVIS,

Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We urge your immediate action on Federal highway legislation, H. R. 4915, which is vitally important to the State's highway program for post-war period. It is essential that State legislatures know what help the States are to have from the Federal Government for highway developments, not only financially but requirements of the Federal Government for matching of Federal funds and limitations as to the use of Federal funds.

ROBERT Y. BURNS,

President, Erie County Motor Club.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 1374. A bill to provide for promotion of certain American prisoners of war; without amendment (Rept. No. 1041); and

H. R. 3187. A bill to amend section 5, Public Law 140, Seventy-seventh Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1038).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 725. A bill to provide for the punishment of persons conspiring to violate the laws relating to counterfeiting, and certain other laws; without amendment (Rept. No. 1039).

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 3592. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1040).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 2078. A bill to establish a central inventory of federally owned real property, to provide for the orderly disposition of certain

surplus real property owned by the United States, and to provide for the disposition of such property for the benefit of veterans so far as practicable; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2079. A bill for the relief of Frank Fulgini; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2080. A bill to authorize the city of Ketchikan, Alaska, to issue bonds in a sum not to exceed \$150,000 for the purpose of constructing and acquiring additions and betterments to and extensions of the electric light and power system of said city, and to provide for the payment thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. ANDREWS introduced S. 2081, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 2082. A bill further amending section 5 (g) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, relating to the War Damage Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. PEPPER introduced S. J. Res. 145, which was referred to the Committee on Rules, and appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF JUDICIAL CODE RELATING TO ASSIGNMENT OF JUDGES—DECISIONS BY MINORITY OF COURT

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I introduce a bill consisting of only one paragraph, which I ask to have read at the desk. Then I shall make a brief statement regarding the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Judicial Code, as amended, is amended by inserting, after section 232 thereof, a new section as follows:

"Sec. 232A. Whenever any Justice of the Supreme Court is disqualified or disabled on account of interest, illness, or any other cause whatever, to hear and determine any cause or matter pending in such Court or brought before it, the Justices of the Court not disqualified are hereby empowered to call in a judge of any circuit court of appeals or a justice of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia to sit in place of the Justice so disqualified or disabled, and the clerk of the Supreme Court, upon the suggestion of the Court, shall notify such judge or justice and request his attendance at the Supreme Court at a time to be designated when such cause or matter may be heard; and it shall be the duty of such judge or justice upon receiving such notice to attend at the Supreme Court at the time so designated. No such judge or justice before whom a cause or matter may have been tried or heard shall sit on the hearing of such cause or matter in the Supreme Court."

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, the decision of the United States Supreme Court, rendered on June 5, 1944, in the case of the United States of America against South Eastern Underwriters Association et al., has given rise to much comment not only as to the issues passed upon in the case but more particularly certain precedents overruled in reaching the decision.

For the purposes of my statement, it is not necessary to refer to the main issues raised by the pleadings and decided in the case itself. I especially direct attention to the practice consistently followed by our Supreme Court since it began opera-

tion in passing on constitutional questions and overruling precedents.

The records show that, first, no decision involving a constitutional question; second, nor any decision overruling any established legal precedent until recently had been rendered by a minority membership of the Supreme Court.

In the recent insurance case, three Justices dissented and two Justices did not participate. Four Justices out of nine on the Court rendered the decision. It is, therefore, a decision by a minority of the full Court.

This decision reverses what has been considered a wise practice of the Court instituted by Chief Justice Marshall 110 years ago when the Court voluntarily asserted that it would not decide any case involving a constitutional question unless a majority of the whole Court should concur. In that case, a majority of the whole Court of seven did not concur in a prepared opinion, whereupon the Court entered the following order directing a reargument:

The practice of this Court is not (except in cases of absolute necessity) to deliver any judgment in cases where constitutional cases are involved, unless four judges concur in opinion, thus making the decision that of a majority of the whole Court. In the present cases four judges do not concur in opinion as to the constitutional questions which have been argued. The Court, therefore directs these cases to be reargued at the next term, under the expectation that a larger number of the judges may be present then.

The reasoning is obvious: That any decision by less than a majority of any court leaves law uncertain and thus may cause endless litigation on the issues raised.

When this practice was announced by Chief Justice Marshall in 1834, the Court consisted of a Chief Justice and six Associate Justices. The case involving the constitutionality of the New York statute had just been argued with two Justices absent.

This practice was followed a year later in the important case of *Briscoe against Commonwealth's Bank of Kentucky*, in which the constitutionality of the State's banking law was involved, and after argument a decision thereon postponed. Counsel in the New York and the Kentucky case having inquired if the Court had come to a final decision, Chief Justice Marshall announced: "The Court cannot know whether there will be a full Court during the term, but as the Court is now composed, the constitutional cases will not be taken up." The Court at that time numbered six, Justice Duval having resigned. For a similar reason action was postponed on the important Charles River bridge case, first argued in 1831.

These cases were not decided until 1937, at which time the number of Justices had been increased from seven to nine. In the New York case, Chief Justice Taney and six Justices then held the State law constitutional in an opinion by Justice Barbour and concurring opinion by Justice Thompson. Justice Story alone dissented. At the previous hearing the Court had split 3 to 2, and thus a

majority of the whole Court had not concurred in any opinion.

In the Kentucky case the Court, in a decision filed in 1837, upheld the constitutionality of the State law in an opinion by Justice McLean. Justice Story dissented, stating that at the argument in 1834 a majority of the Justices who then heard it, including Chief Justice Marshall, had believed the statute unconstitutional. A majority of the whole Court had not then concurred, and, therefore, the case had been ordered to be reargued under the practice announced by the Chief Justice.

This practice was undoubtedly founded on the sound principle that when the Constitution of the United States was involved a decision by a majority of the full Court would carry more weight and receive more public confidence than a decision by a mere majority of a quorum of Justices present, which is always of doubtful validity in any case.

The records will show that this practice of Chief Justice Marshall was followed in 1845 by the Court under Chief Justice Taney in the case of *Smith against Turner*, involving the constitutionality of a New York immigrant law. At that time, owing to two vacancies on the bench and a division of opinion among the other seven Justices, there was no opinion concurred in by a majority of the full Court, and accordingly the case was ordered for reargument and not decided until 1849.

In the recent insurance case, unfortunately, the four Justices rendering the opinion did not see fit to follow the practice of the Court by waiting before rendering their opinion until a majority Court should concur in a decision on the grave constitutional questions involved.

This refusal to follow the long-established practice seems not to be an isolated instance in the present court; for in the very recent case of *Feldman against United States*, decided on May 29, 1944, involving an important constitutional question under the fifth amendment as to the right to introduce in a Federal court evidence which was illegal in a State court, the decision was rendered by four Justices, with three Justices dissenting and two not sitting. Thus, a decision on a constitutional point was again rendered by less than a majority of the full Court.

If the 4-to-3 opinion delivered by Justice Black in the recent insurance case is to be considered as overruling the long-established law expressed by a unanimous court in 1869, in *Paul v. Virginia* (8 Wallace 168), then it should be carefully noted that it is a far-reaching decision overruling previous decisions by Justices numbering less than a majority of the whole Court.

During 155 years since 1789 there have been 70 decisions of the Court overruling previous cases. Heretofore, the opinion of the court has always been concurred in by at least a majority of the full Court. While in less important cases there have been occasionally decisions by a minority of the Court, but not in cases involving the overruling of a previous decision.

Chief Justice Stone, in his dissenting opinion in the recent insurance case, among other reasons given for his dissent, said:

The decision now rendered repudiates this long-continued and consistent construction of the commerce clause and the Sherman Act. We do not say that that is in itself a sufficient ground for declining to join in the Court's decision. This Court has never committed itself to any rule or policy that it will not bow to the lessons of experience and the force of better reasoning by overruling a mistaken precedent. This is especially the case when the meaning of the Constitution is at issue and a mistaken construction is one which cannot be corrected by legislative action.

To give blind adherence to a rule or policy that no decision of this Court is to be overruled would be itself to overrule many decisions of the Court which do not accept that view. But the rule of stare decisis embodies a wise policy because it is often more important that a rule of law be settled than that it be settled right. This is especially so where, as here, Congress is not without regulatory power. (*Cf. Penn Dairies v. Milk Control Commission* (318 U. S. 261, 271, 275).) The question then is not whether an earlier decision should ever be overruled, but whether a particular decision ought to be. And before overruling a precedent in any case it is the duty of the Court to make certain that more harm will not be done in rejecting than in retaining a rule of even dubious validity. Compare *Helvering v. Griffiths* (318 U. S. 371, 400-4).

The constitutions of many States have a provision similar to article V, section 6, of the Constitution of Florida, which provides as follows:

The legislature shall have power to prescribe regulations for calling into the supreme court a judge of the circuit court, to hear and determine any matters pending before the court in the place of any justice thereof that shall be disqualified or disabled in such case from interest or other cause.

Under this authority a statute was enacted empowering the State supreme court to call in a circuit judge to sit in place of any justice disabled or disqualified in any case.

These provisions of organic and statutory laws in Florida have worked admirably and thus prevented uncertainties caused by overruling long-established principles of law and constitutional interpretations.

In an effort to apply the same laudable principles and to preclude or prevent any case involving a constitutional question or a decision overruling a previous decision of the Supreme Court being decided by less than a majority of the whole Court, I have carefully prepared and now introduce and submit for ultimate passage the bill which has just been read at the desk.

The bill (S. 2081) to amend the Judicial Code so as to provide for the assignment of judges of the circuit courts of appeals and justices of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, in lieu of justices of the Supreme Court disqualified in any case, introduced by Mr. ANDREWS, was read the first time by title, the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BROADCAST OF CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I think the whole country was very much influenced and delighted by being able to hear over the radio the proceedings of the two great national conventions. I have been immensely impressed by the number of people who after our convention was held have made reference in talking to me to some detail of the convention which they had heard over the radio. I think the millions of people of the country remained close to their radios to hear the proceedings of both conventions because they knew that there the policies of their Government were being determined. Because the people are interested in the democratic processes, and because the radio brought the conventions almost into the homes and the public places of the country the proceedings of the conventions had a profound influence upon the thinking of our people.

Mr. President, it has seemed to me for some time a project worthy of consideration as to whether the proceedings of the Congress might be broadcast to the people of the country. Surely the people of this country are sovereign. Surely all of us regard ourselves as their spokesmen. We are all trying to serve their objectives and their great purposes. If they could by the marvel of the radio be brought, as it were, as the visitors in the galleries are privileged to be, to be witnesses of the deliberations of their Representatives and Senators in Congress, I believe it would be in furtherance of the democratic process.

So, Mr. President, I introduce and ask to have appropriately referred a joint resolution authorizing the broadcasting of the proceedings of the Senate and the House of Representatives. I bespeak for the joint resolution the consideration of my colleagues in the Senate. It is not contended that the joint resolution is perfect in form. It does not contemplate the setting up of any Government-owned facilities. It does direct the Architect of the Capitol to aid the broadcasting companies in the broadcasting of the proceedings of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 145) authorizing the broadcasting of the proceedings of the Senate and the House of Representatives, introduced by Mr. PEPPER, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Rules.

DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY AND PLANTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2045) to provide for the disposal of certain Government property and plants, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN ISLANDS BY THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask that it be read at the desk. It is short.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 320), as follows:

Resolved, That, in order to promote and protect the peace and security of the United States, it is the sense of the Senate—

(1) That any treaty or agreement terminating the present war against Japan, or settling the questions arising out of such war, should provide that the United States shall have and retain as its permanent possessions all islands which on December 5, 1941, were in the possession of or mandated to Japan and which lie between the Equator and the thirtieth parallel of latitude north, including Formosa and the Ryukyu Islands.

(2) That, in settling the questions arising out of the present wars and in making provisions for the maintenance of peace, the United States should acquire as its permanent possessions Bermuda Island and all islands in the West Indies which are now the possessions of European nations.

Resolved further, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to enter into negotiations with the Republic of Ecuador with a view to obtaining the Galapagos Islands as permanent possessions of the United States.

Mr. HILL. Does not the Senator desire the resolution to be referred to a committee?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator is not asking for immediate consideration of the resolution, as I understand.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no. I am merely submitting it and I ask that it be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SHORTAGE OF BOXCARS FOR GRAIN TRANSPORTATION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, last October I submitted Senate Resolution 185 touching the shortage of boxcars to handle grain in the Northwest. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and a subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] considered the resolution. The subcommittee did a magnificent job. I have been receiving a great many telegrams which disclose that this year's crop is encountering the same situation which was faced last year. I have prepared a resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and, because of the fact that the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is absent, I ask that it be referred to the subcommittee of which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is chairman.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I did not quite understand. What was the Senator's request?

Mr. LANGER. Simply that a resolution I am submitting be referred to the same subcommittee as that to which Senate Resolution 185, dealing with the same subject, was referred last year.

Mr. HILL. Is that a subcommittee of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee?

Mr. LANGER. It is.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator that I think that the Chair will refer the resolution to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and, although I cannot speak for the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], I am quite certain that the resolution, in view of what the Senator has said about it would be referred to the subcommittee. That, however, would be a matter in the hands of the full committee and the chairman of the committee.

Mr. LANGER. The only reason I ask that it be sent to the subcommittee is that the Senator from Montana is absent.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator that, in view of the fact that that committee is now in being and has jurisdiction over the matter, I am quite certain it will go to that subcommittee. What the Presiding Officer will do no doubt will be to refer the resolution to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. LANGER. I am very anxious to have the same subcommittee consider the resolution I am now submitting which considered the resolution last year, because they are familiar with the subject.

Mr. HILL. I am quite certain, from what the Senator has said, that it will be referred to that subcommittee, but, so far as the Senate is concerned, I think all the Senate can do is to refer the resolution to the full committee which is the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. LANGER. While I am on the floor, I may say that the Northwest never got any better deal than they got from the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. The whole State feels under a debt of gratitude to him. We got results because of the action on that resolution.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, since the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] so graciously referred to the work of the subcommittee of which I happen to be the chairman, I wish to say that I appreciate his courteous statement. I do not know just what disposition the chairman of the full committee will desire to make of the resolution which has been offered, and which will undoubtedly be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce; but if it shall come to my subcommittee, we shall be glad to handle it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution submitted by the Senator from North Dakota will be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The resolution (S. Res. 321) was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the causes of the existing shortage of railroad cars for the transportation of wheat, flax, oats, barley, rye, and other grains in the States of North Dakota and Texas, and means of relieving such shortage. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation,

together with its recommendations for necessary legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$——, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE PUGET SOUND NAVY YARD

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by the President last Saturday at the Puget Sound Navy Yard be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, officers and men of the Puget Sound Navy Yard, I am glad to be back here in well-known surroundings, for, as you know, I have been coming here off and on ever since I was Assistant Secretary of the Navy in 1913, and that's over 30 years ago.

It's nearly about 4 weeks ago since I left Washington, but, of course, at all times I have been in close touch with the work there and also in daily communication with our forces in the European and Far Eastern theaters of war.

Since my visit here at Bremerton nearly 2 years ago I have been happy at all times to know of the splendid progress that is being maintained—kept up—both here and at many other places on the coast, progress in turning out ships and planes and munitions of almost every other kind and in the training of men and women for all of the armed forces.

So I have thought that you would be interested in an informal summary of the trip I have just taken to Hawaii and from there to the Aleutian Islands and Alaska, from which, when I get across the Sound, I am about to step foot on the shore of the continental United States again.

When I got to San Diego 3 weeks ago I spent 3 days before going on shipboard, and I had the opportunity at the southern end of the Pacific coast to visit many of the patients in the large hospitals there, a large number of these patients having just come back from the fighting in the Marshall Islands and the Marianas.

And I also witnessed a large practice landing operation on the beaches of southern California, between Los Angeles and San Diego.

It's a kind of warfare that has been most successfully developed by us during the past 2 years. It's a warfare of a wholly new type calling for all kinds of new equipment and new training.

And I think I can safely say that no other nation in the world has worked it out as successfully as we have—the way we have shown it within the past few weeks in the capture of Saipan and Tinian and the recapturing of Guam, an effort which is resulting in new threats against Japan itself and against all of their operations in the Southwest Pacific.

You know, it takes a personal observation—you've got to see things with your own eyes, such as I saw from a high bluff right on the coast overlooking the shore below—to understand how well the application of experience in war is being carried out.

The landing craft, a wholly new type of ship, one we didn't dream of 2 years and half ago, came to the beach from the transports that were lying offshore under cover of a fog.

They came on in waves, the marines and the infantry getting the first foothold, followed by other waves and then by all manner of equipment, ammunition and wire and tanks, all protected by air coverage and preceded theoretically—because I wouldn't be here today if it was real—by a devastating bombardment from heavy ships lying offshore.

When the beachhead was obtained to a depth of a mile or two there followed the unloading of great quantities of supplies and stores of all kinds, including tanks and trucks and jeeps.

Timing—that's why we have to practice this—timing is of the utmost importance. Any operation of this kind has to be carried out click-click-click, right on schedule, together with instantaneous communication—both the radio, the written kind, and the voice from the shore to the ships and to the planes themselves.

Here was demonstrated the perfect cooperation between all the services—Army and Navy and marines, and to this should be added the teamwork for the immediate care of the wounded—in the case I saw it was the theoretically wounded—and the quick transfer of them back to the hospital ships.

We in our comfortable homes, I think, ought to realize more than we do that, to all troops and marines who are to conduct a new landing expedition on some far distant island in the Pacific, as well as on the coast of France, this amphibious training is being given at a number of places in the United States before the expedition ever starts.

Hundreds of instructors are required, nearly all men who have participated in actual combat operations beforehand, and many of these instructors, most of them, indeed, will, of course, accompany the troops in the actual operation of the future landings.

The cruiser, which is on her way to another place, the cruiser on which I went from San Diego to Honolulu, is one of a number of what we call post-treaty cruisers, much larger, more powerful, and faster than the pre-war cruisers, which were limited by the old treaties to 10,000 tons.

This particular ship on which I voyaged joined the Pacific Fleet less than a year ago in the western and southwestern Pacific. Hers is a magnificent record. Her skipper and crew have brought her through all of these many offensive missions unscathed, 15 of them, 15 battles.

And because of the experience that she has gained and that they have gained she is an even more powerful weapon than she was the day that she joined the fleet.

Well, the voyage was uneventful and we arrived at Pearl Harbor on July 26. At this moment may I just add a word of appreciation to the press and the radio of our country. You know we have a voluntary censorship, purely voluntary. I want to thank them for the protection and the security which they gave to me and to my party at a time on this trip when nearly all the time I was within easy reach of enemy action.

The press associations and some of the newspapers actually refused to publish the facts which they got from local friends who had heard of my arrival and my trip around

the Hawaiian Islands—or from local friends whose sons out there had written home about it—and the newspapers didn't print it. That is a modern marvel.

Well, I got there on the 26th of July and what an amazing change since my visit there 10 years ago—as big and bigger a change than a comparison between the Puget Sound Navy Yard of today with what this was 10 years ago.

But out there—the change. At that time Pearl Harbor had maintained a steady growth as this yard has, so that today it is capable of making repairs to the heaviest ships, and employs a force nearly ten times as great as it did then. And, incidentally, very many of that force came straight there during the past 2½ years from the west coast.

All of the battleships and smaller craft that were sunk or damaged in the attack on Pearl Harbor on the 7th of December 1941 have been raised with the exception of the *Arizona*. In her case, because of the explosion in her forward magazine, salvage was impossible. But again in her case, her main battery of heavy guns was removed and remounted and now forms a part of the coastal defenses on the island of Oahu.

All of the other ships are afloat, most of them having been put back into commission here at Puget Sound, and nobody will ever forget that.

And, incidentally, the ships that you put back into commission, what you did to them in the process, has made of them vastly more powerful ships, better ships, with more gun power than they had before they were sunk.

And that's one thing that I'll never forget, the way that sunken fleet was set afloat again and has gone over the world in actually carrying out the plans of this war.

They've been in service, they've been in action, in the Pacific and elsewhere. Indeed, one of them, I think it is the *Nevada*, took part in the bombardment of the coast of Normandy during and after the landing operations there on the 6th of June this year.

I spent 3 days on the island of Oahu, and everywhere, as at the navy yard, the war activities have multiplied almost beyond belief.

On the afternoon of my arrival my old friend Gen. Douglas MacArthur arrived by air from New Guinea and we began a series of extremely interesting and useful conferences, accompanied by Admiral Nimitz and by my own Chief of Staff, Admiral Leahy, who stands beside me now, and General Richardson, the commanding general of the Army forces in the Hawaiian area, and Admiral Halsey, commander of the Third Fleet.

In the 3 days we were there we talked about Pacific problems and the best methods of conducting the Pacific campaign in the days to come. These discussions developed complete accord both in the understanding of the problem that confronts us and in the opinion as to the best methods for its solution.

All of us must bear in mind the enormous size of the Pacific Ocean, the Pacific area, keeping a mental map of the world constantly in mind. The distances are greater there than anywhere else on earth.

In the old days the Hawaiian Islands used to be considered an outpost. We were not allowed to fortify Guam, nor did we fortify Wake, or Midway, or Samoa.

Today the Hawaiian Islands are no longer a mere outpost. They constitute a major base from which, and from the Pacific coast, front-line operations are being conducted twice as far away as the distance between the coast and Hawaii itself.

The Hawaiian Islands have helped to make possible the victories at Guadalcanal and New Guinea and the Marshalls and the Marianas. The islands will make possible future operations in China—will make possible the recapture and independence of the Philippines and make possible the carrying of war

into the home islands of Japan itself and their capital city of Tokyo.

In a few minutes I think it will interest you if you will let me say a few additional words about the future of the Pacific.

But first, during the rest of my stay in Hawaii, I visited the many activities, including the great airfields, the hospitals, and an ambulance plane at Hickam Field which had just flown in with wounded men from Saipan. I reviewed the Seventh Division, which has made such a splendid record.

I saw a large Army group that was going through a complete course in jungle warfare—they have to do it there because we haven't got any jungles around here—jungle warfare, an art which we have developed so expertly that our troops are more than a match in the jungle for any Japanese whom we have met yet. And I am proud of all of this basic training and the final training of our sons—all that they're getting both at home and when they get near the front.

After rejoining our ship we headed for the Aleutian Islands. I had read about them—heard about them—but I'd never been there before.

Arriving 4 days later at Adak, which is one of the more westerly islands of the group, there again I found intense activity at what might be called a nearly completed advance base. It was from there that a great part of the expeditions for the recapture of Attu and Kiska started. Adak 2 years ago was a bleak and practically uninhabited spot which, with the other Aleutian Islands, seemed relatively unimportant in the plans for the security of our own continent.

You here can well realize the commotion that followed the Japanese occupation of Attu and Kiska. You've dreamt of Japanese marching up the streets of Bremerton or Seattle tomorrow morning. You may have thought that the Chiefs of Staff in Washington were not paying enough attention to the threat against Alaska and the coast. We realized, of course, that such a Japanese threat could become serious if it was unopposed. But we knew also that Japan did not have the naval and air power to carry the threat into effect without greater resources and a longer time to carry it out.

Preparation to throw the Japanese from their foothold—very skimpy foothold—had been laid even before the Japs got there, and the rest of the story you know.

It took great preparations and heavy fighting to eject them from Attu and by the time the great expedition to recapture Kiska got there the Japanese had decided that discretion was the better part of valor. They decided that retirement and retreat was better for them than *hara-kiri*, and so they abandoned the Aleutians.

The climate at Adak is not the most inviting in the world, but I want to say a word of appreciation to the thousands of officers and men of all the services who have built up this base and other bases, many other bases, in the extreme northwest of the American Continent, built them up in such a short time to a point where the people of our Pacific Coast, the people of British Columbia and of Alaska, can feel certain that we are safe against Japanese invasion on any large scale.

We were delayed by fog and rain as almost everybody is up in those parts; we had to give up putting in at Dutch Harbor but we did stop at Kodiak, a large island off the end of the Alaskan Peninsula. Here, also, the three services completed a very excellent, though smaller, base. The first little town really that we built in those parts, and there's actually a small community there, the first that we saw in Alaskan waters and the first trees that we saw, because the outer Aleutians just don't have trees. That town and those trees made me think of the coasts of Maine and Newfoundland.

We were told that a number of officers and men at this place and other posts are considering settling in Alaska after the war is over. I do hope that this is so because the development of Alaska has only been scratched and it is still the country of the pioneers, and in one sense every American is a descendant of pioneers.

Only a small part of Alaska's resources have been explored and there is, of course, an abundance of fish and game and timber, together with great possibilities for agriculture. I could not help remembering that the climate and the crops and other resources are not essentially different from northern Europe—Norway and Sweden, Finland—for the people of these countries in spite of the cold and in winter darkness have brought their civilizations to a very high and very prosperous level. On my return to Washington I am going to set up a study of Alaska and the Aleutian Islands as a place to which many veterans of this war, especially those who do not have strong home roots, can go to become pioneers. Alaska is a land with a very small population, but I am convinced that it has great opportunities for those who are willing to work and to help build up all kinds of new things in new lands.

So this trip has given me a chance to talk over the social and economic future of the Hawaiian group with Governor Stainback and the future of the people of Alaska with Governor Gruening. By the way, he asked me to assure you that the tan which I have acquired in Alaska in a week has come from the bright sunlight of Alaska. Near Juneau one afternoon, when we were nearly fogged out, I played hockey for 3 hours. I went fishing and I caught one halibut and one flounder.

Speaking again of the future, of the future of the defense of the Pacific and the use of its strong points in order to prevent attacks against us.

You who live in the Pacific Northwest have realized that a line for sea and air navigation following the Great Circle course from Puget Sound to Siberia and China passes very close to the Alaskan coast and thence westward along the line of the Aleutian Islands.

From the point of view of national defense, therefore, it is essential that our control of this route shall be undisputed. Everybody in Siberia and China knows that we have no ambition to acquire land on the Asiatic Continent.

We, as a people, are utterly opposed to aggression and sneak attacks. But we, as a people, are insistent that other nations must not, under any circumstances, through the foreseeable future, commit such attacks against the United States. Therefore, it is essential that we be fully prepared to prevent them for all time to come.

The word and the honor of Japan cannot be trusted. That is a simple statement from the military and naval and air point of view. But with the end of a Japanese threat, soon we hope, there is an excellent outlook for a permanent peace in the whole of the Pacific area.

It is therefore natural and proper for us to think of the economic and the commercial future. It is logical that we should foresee a great interchange of commerce between our shores and those of Siberia and China.

And in this commercial development Alaska and the Aleutian Islands become automatic stepping stones for trade, both by water and by cargo planes. And this means the automatic development of transportation on the way there, including the Puget Sound area.

It is as long as 10 years, I think, that I talked with Mr. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada, in regard to the development of highways, in regard to air routes and even

a railroad by way of the Northwest and British Columbia and the Yukon. Great interest in both nations was aroused but it took the war to get quick action.

Today the Alcan Highway is practically completed and an air route to Fairbanks enables us to deliver thousands of planes to our ally, Russia, by way of Alaska and Bering Straits and Siberia. These planes are an important factor in the brilliant and brave advance of the Russian armies on their march to Berlin. And I might observe also that our close relations, our true friendship with Canada during these years has proved to be an illustrious example of working hand in hand with your neighbor for the general good.

South of this northern route, Alaska and the Aleutians, the use of other island groups must also be thought of for defense and for commerce in getting to and from the Asiatic and the American continents. We understand at last the importance of the Hawaiian Islands. It is important that we have other bases, forward bases nearer to Japan than Hawaii lies.

The same thing, we have to remember, holds true in regard to the defense of all the other American republics, 20 others, from Mexico down past the Panama Canal and all the way down to Chile. There are hundreds of islands in the South Pacific that bear the same relation to South America and Central America and the Panama Canal as Hawaii bears to North America.

These islands are mostly in the possession of the British Empire and the French. They are important commercially just as they are from the defense point of view because they lead to New Zealand, and Australia, and the Dutch islands and the southern Philippines. With all these places we undoubtedly are going to have a growing trade.

We have no desire to ask for any possessions of the United Nations. But the United Nations who are working so well with us in the winning of the war will, I am confident, be glad to join us in protection against aggression and in machinery to prevent aggression. With them and with their help I am sure that we can agree completely so that Central and South America will be as safe against attack—attack from the South Pacific—as North America is going to be very soon from the North Pacific as well.

The self-interests of our allies is going to be affected by fair and friendly collaboration with us. They, too, will gain in national security. They will gain economically. The destinies of the peoples of the whole Pacific will for many years be entwined with our own destiny. Already there are stirring among hundreds of millions of them a desire for the right to work out their own destinies and they show no evidence in this Pacific area to overrun the earth—with one exception.

That exception is and has been for many, many years that of Japan and the Japanese people—because whether or not the people of Japan itself know and approve of what their war lords and their home lords have done for nearly a century, the fact remains that they seem to be giving hearty approval to the Japanese policy of acquisition of their neighbors and their neighbors' lands and a military and economic control of as many other nations as they can lay their hands on.

It is an unfortunate fact that other nations cannot trust Japan. It is an unfortunate fact that years of proof must pass by before we can trust Japan and before we can classify Japan as a member of the society of nations which seeks permanent peace and whose word we can take.

In removing the future menace of Japan to us and to our continent we are holding out the hope that other people in the Far East can be freed from the same threat.

The people of the Philippines never have wished and never will wish to be slaves of

Japan. Of the people of Korea, that ancient kingdom which was overrun by the Japanese half a century ago, the same is true. The peoples of Manchuria and all the rest of China feel the same.

The same thing is true of the peoples of Indochina and Siam, the peoples of Java, and even the most primitive peoples of New Guinea and the so-called mandated islands which I am glad to say we are in the splendid process of throwing the Japs out from.

I am glad to have the opportunity of taking this short trip, first, for the conferences with General MacArthur and Admiral Nimitz, and, secondly, for the first-hand view of certain bases that are of vital importance to the ending of the war and to the prevention in the future of any similar attack.

More than a million of our troops are today overseas in the Pacific. The war is well in hand in this vast area, but I cannot tell you, if I knew, when the war will be over, either in Europe or in the Far East or the war against Japan itself.

It will be over sooner, if the people of this country will maintain the making of the necessary supplies of ships and planes and all the things that go with them. By so doing we shall hasten the day of the peace. By so doing we will save our own pocketbooks and those of our children. And by so doing we will stand a better chance of substantial unity not only at home but among the United Nations in laying so securely what we all want, the foundation of a lasting peace.

VIEW OF LEO WOLMAN ON SO-CALLED MURRAY-KILGORE BILL

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, in the Washington Post for last Sunday, Mr. Leo Wolman incisively discussed the Kilgore-Murray-Truman bill. No one can deny that Mr. Wolman speaks with extraordinary authority in respect to labor relationships. His credentials bespeak his breadth of vision and experience. From 1920 to 1931, significantly, he was in charge of research for the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America. He was Chairman of the Labor Advisory Board for N. R. A. He was a member of the National Labor Board as a representative of labor, and Chairman of the special Automobile Labor Board. In World War No. 1 he was a confidant of President Wilson, served on the War Industries Board with Mr. Baruch, and was attached to the American Peace Mission at Paris. He was Chairman of the Interstate Commission on Unemployment Insurance. These and many similar assignments give extraordinary importance to his judgment in this field. He cannot be lightly dismissed when he bluntly says over his own signature that—

The Murray-Kilgore bill . . . was the most effective means yet devised to guarantee a large and permanent army of unemployed for many years after the end of this war—

And that—

We need plans for the transition from war to peace. We need to deal liberally with the members of our armed forces and our war workers. But we can ill afford a national orgy of spending which is calculated to discourage employment and make our labor and economic policies the football of politics. For that reason it is fortunate that the Senate threw out the Murray-Kilgore bill.

Mr. President, this brief text by Mr. Wolman so completely summarizes the reasons why many of us voted against

the bill that I ask unanimous consent for its reprint at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE FAILURE FORTUNATE—MURRAY-KILGORE BILL CALLED WAY TO INSURE ARMY OF UNEMPLOYED

(By Leo Wolman)

The Murray-Kilgore bill (the War Mobilization and Adjustment Act of 1944), in either its earlier or later version, was the most effective means yet devised to guarantee a large and permanent army of unemployed for many years after the end of this war.

The authors of this measure could not possibly have had much idea of how a measure of this type could be administered and how much it would cost. Among other things, it provided administrative machinery which, if one reads the words carefully, was empowered to wield greater authority over the economy of this country in peacetime than we saw fit to permit the Government to exercise during total war.

The various and sundry powers conferred by this bill granted administrative discretion on a scale, and with respect to so many diverse questions, never before contemplated in a peacetime statute.

The unemployment benefit provisions of the bill stood a strong chance of destroying the entire institution of social insurance or of converting it into a gigantic, national machinery of relief. The greatest danger faced by any plan of unemployment insurance arises out of policies which put a premium on not working. Once policies of this sort permeate an insurance system, it ceases to be insurance and becomes a relief.

WOULD TEND TO DISCOURAGE ABSORPTION OF WORKERS

After the war, a well-managed unemployment insurance system would encourage re-employment and not retard or obstruct it. But proposals like those contained in the Murray-Kilgore bill would make employment so costly by making unemployment so expensive as to discourage the absorption of war workers and veterans into genuine jobs.

A work administrator, created by the bill to manage a restraining program as well as the distribution of benefits, was entrusted with enough power to make him the arbiter of the post-war labor standards of the country. He thus would be a war labor board, a fair labor standards administrator, and a national labor relations board, all rolled into one.

He assumed this position through the authority granted him by the bill to review, "on his own motion," decisions of appeals tribunals charged with defining "suitable employment" and other things under our unemployment-insurance system.

Since defining "suitable employment" is one of the most critical factors in the adjustments which need take place in the post-war labor markets, this new functionary was authorized to reverse findings and policies of State appeals boards and set up his own standards of definition with precious little guidance from Congress as to the country's policies on these vital matters.

With these and other equally extensive powers at his disposal, the work administrator could have taken an effective step in the direction of federalizing our State unemployment insurance and establishing uniform standards of wages and working conditions, not to speak of continuous unionizing of industry, throughout the United States.

PLANS NEEDED BUT NOT DISCOURAGEMENT TO EMPLOY

These proposals were made at a time when the total unemployment insurance reserves of the country exceed \$5,000,000,000 by a substantial amount and are still increasing.

In the visible future every State insurance administration has ample reserves to meet any conceivable drain upon its funds. Reciprocity arrangements worked out between the States in recent years provide machinery for handling the cases of workers thrown out of jobs in one State and seeking employment and unemployment benefits in another. If there is the need, the State can be encouraged to liberalize its present standards of benefit, as some, in fact, have already done.

Finally, the potential recipients of benefits have had a long period of unusually good employment at the highest of standards and might be expected to have laid aside reserves in no inconsiderable amount for their own private use.

We need plans for the transition from war to peace. We need to deal liberally with the members of our armed forces and our war workers. But we can ill afford a national orgy of spending which is calculated to discourage employment and make our labor and economic policies the football of politics. For that reason it is fortunate that the Senate threw out the Murray-Kilgore bill.

L.T. GEN. GEORGE SMITH PATTON, JR.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an excellent editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of August 13, entitled "General Patton."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial is as follows:

GENERAL PATTON

Ever since the invasion of Sicily the German high command and its forces in the field have had a healthy respect for General Patton. They know a good commander when they see one and are mauled by him. The unfortunate slapping incident did not change their opinion of the man, nor did any of the intemperate criticism of him in this country. During his long absence from combat, they have been speculating a bit nervously about where he might turn up next. Now they think they have the answer. According to the Nazi news agency Transocean, they strongly suspect that he is in France commanding the Third American Army. The news agency respectfully adds that he is an exponent of mobile warfare.

General Eisenhower's headquarters has made no such announcement and no Allied communique has even hinted about the Third American Army or the whereabouts of General Patton. Nevertheless, although the Germans may be all wrong, they cannot be blamed if they suspect that something new has been added to our power in France. And since General Patton is most certainly an exponent of mobile warfare and since our forces are spreading and racing like a prairie fire right up to the environs of Paris, the Nazi agency's report is at least logical and may yet be confirmed as true. And if it is, all the loose things said about General Patton in the past will seem worse than childish. A great number of Americans would be happy to see this come to pass, vindicating a man who may be short on diplomacy but whose qualities as a fighting officer are beyond dispute.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURDOCK NOMINATING SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH FOR VICE PRESIDENT

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator MURDOCK nominating Senator THOMAS of Utah for Vice President of the United States at the Democratic National Convention at Chicago on July 21, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOURTH OF JULY ADDRESS AT MILWAUKEE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him in Milwaukee, Wis., on July 4, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial Jim Farley's Resignation, published in the June 14, 1944, issue of the Grand Junction (Colo.) Sentinel, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND ISOLATIONISM—LETTER TO THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Brad Stephens, dated July 31, 1944, published in the Christian Science Monitor and dealing with the subject of the Republican Party and isolationism, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT THE CENTURIES SAY AGAINST THE HOURS—SERMON BY DR. LEAVELL

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a sermon entitled "What the Centuries Say Against the Hours," delivered by Dr. Roland Q. Leavell in the First Baptist Church, Tampa, Fla., April 30, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOW TRUMAN WON OVER HIS ENEMIES—ARTICLE BY WILLARD SHELTON

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "How TRUMAN Won Over His Enemies," by Willard Shelton, from the Chicago Sun of August 13, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR CHANCE FOR LASTING PEACE—EDITORIAL BY LITTLETON UPSHUR

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Chance for Lasting Peace," by Littleton Upshur, editor of the Greenwood Commonwealth of Greenwood, Miss., which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED WASHINGTON HOSPITAL CENTER

[Mr. TYDINGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hospital of the Future," published in the Washington Sunday Star of August 13, 1944, and an editorial entitled "Hospital Project," published in the Washington Post of August 14, 1944, which appear in the Appendix.]

DISSEMINATION OF NEWS AND INFORMATION TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—REPORT OF PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections I report Senate bill 2050, which was referred to that committee for consideration. The committee has unanimously voted to instruct me to report favorably, with certain amendments, the bill (S. 2050) to amend the act of August 2, 1939, entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," as amended by the act of April 1, 1944, entitled "An act to facilitate voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others, absent from the place of their residence, and to amend the act of September 16, 1942, and for other purposes." I do so at this time and submit a report in writ-

ing (No. 1037) covering the bill. To the report are appended letters from the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy approving the bill as amended.

In view of the importance of disposing of this matter promptly, and the unanimity and nonpartisan character of the action taken by the committee, I ask unanimous consent that the rule be suspended and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

I may say that the changes in the bill as originally introduced by me, for myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], are largely the result of suggestions made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. In order that the Senate may be apprised of the significance of the changes, as the Senator from Ohio is present, I think it would be well for him to explain the changes which have been adopted by the committee this morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2050) to amend the act of August 2, 1939, entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," as amended by the act of April 1, 1944, entitled "An act to facilitate voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others, absent from the place of their residence, and to amend the act of September 16, 1942, and for other purposes."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to immediate consideration?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I merely wish to join in the request of the Senator from Rhode Island that immediate consideration be had. If the suggested changes are to be made, they should be made at once, so that the bill can go to the House of Representatives.

I may say that I have worked with the Senator from Rhode Island on the amendments to his bill, and he and I have agreed entirely on the amendments which have been suggested. So I hope unanimous consent to consider the bill today may be granted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2050) to amend the act of August 2, 1939, entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," as amended by the act of April 1, 1944, entitled "An act to facilitate voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces, members of the merchant marine, and others, absent from the place of their residence, and to amend the act of September 16, 1942, and for other purposes," which had been reported from the Committee on Privileges and Elections with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, on page 2, line 11, before the words "or department", to strike out "officer, agency", and to insert "agency"; and on line 16, after the words "House of Representatives", to insert "or obviously calculated to create bias for or against a particular candidate in any such election", so as to read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 22 of the act of August 2, 1939, as amended by the

act of April 1, 1944 (Public Law 277, 78th Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 22. It shall be unlawful for any officer of, or person employed in, the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, including the Army and Navy, to deliver or cause to be delivered to persons in the armed forces of the United States any general communication, Government magazine, Government newspaper, motion-picture film, or other literature or material, or to make, or cause to be made, any broadcast to the armed forces of the United States, paid for in whole or in part with Government funds, or sponsored by the Government, or any agency or department thereof, including the Army and Navy, which when considered in its entirety contains political propaganda obviously designed to affect the result of any election for President, Vice President, Presidential elector, Member of the Senate, or Member of the House of Representatives, or obviously calculated to create bias for or against a particular candidate in any such election, except as hereinafter provided.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, page 2, after line 18, to insert:

(1) The word "sponsored", as used herein, shall not be deemed to include sales at or through post exchanges, ship's service stores, or ship's stores of the armed forces, or purchases by company funds, welfare funds, or other similar nonappropriated funds of the armed forces.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, page 3, after line 7, to strike out:

(a) books, magazines, newspapers, or other written material of general circulation to the public in the United States; or motion picture films, radio broadcasts, radio rebroadcasts, plays, or other news or entertainment material as generally presented to the public in the United States; or written material for use in educational programs of the armed forces similar to written material generally provided for use in civilian educational programs by recognized educational institutions in the United States.

And insert:

(a) Books, magazines, or newspapers of general circulation in the United States and also, in an overseas command, those of general circulation therein; or motion-picture films, radio broadcasts, radio rebroadcasts, plays, or entertainment material as generally presented to the public in the United States; or written material for use in educational programs of the armed forces similar to written material generally provided for use in civilian educational programs by recognized educational institutions in the United States: *Provided*, That the selection of such books, magazines, and newspapers, when the selection is necessarily limited by difficulties of transportation or other exigencies of war, shall be made in some impartial manner prescribed by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy for their respective services, such as a preference expressed by members of the armed forces, or the recommendation of expert committees, or otherwise.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, page 4, line 11, after "(b)", to strike out "servicemen's publications, or other entertainment, information, or educational material in any medium originated or sponsored by the Army or Navy: *Provided*, That coverage or presentation therein, as news or information, of public events and affairs and persons in public

life shall be nonpartisan and impartial." and insert "impartial and nonpartisan coverage or presentation of news or information of public events and affairs and persons in public life, through the media of servicemen's publications and motion pictures, radio programs, news services, and educational and orientation courses originated by the Army or Navy."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 11, to insert:

Sec. 2. Such act as amended is further amended by adding after section 24 thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 25. The provisions of sections 22 and 23 shall expire upon the expiration of 6 months after the termination of hostilities in the present war as proclaimed by the President or declared by concurrent resolution of the Congress."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will be authorized to make the necessary changes in paragraph numbers.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, I would like to say a few words on the bill now pending. I personally have always opposed any restrictions whatever upon information sent to or furnished to soldiers or to anyone in the armed services. Therefore, when the bill came before our committee, the question was: In what way will this limit or restrict the news or information to be sent to the soldiers and to our fighting forces?

The better informed, the better the soldier or fighting man.

I am informed this morning by the Army and the Navy that by the passing of this amendment sponsored by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAF] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] they will in no way be restricted by the law now in force; in other words, that the restrictions now in existence will be eliminated and the Army and Navy will be in the same position as if no law was passed and will be only restricted by the exigency of the war. That being true, I voted in the committee to report the bill to the Senate. The vote in the committee was unanimous to report this bill to amend the original law.

I should like to say a few words regarding section 22. This section refers to political propaganda printed by the United States Government at Government expense or sponsored by the United States Government. While I am opposed to any restriction on news or information furnished to the armed services, I have no objection to this section in this particular bill, for I believe the Government should not print political propaganda at public expense and furnish it to anyone, whether civilians or those in the armed forces.

The proposed section reads:

It shall be unlawful for any officer of, or person employed in, the executive branch of the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, including the Army and Navy, to deliver or cause to be delivered to persons in the armed forces of the United States any general communication, Government magazine, Government newspaper,

motion-picture film, or other literature or material, or to make, or cause to be made, any broadcast to the armed forces of the United States, paid for in whole or in part with Government funds, or sponsored by the Government, or any agency or department thereof, including the Army and Navy, which when considered in its entirety contains political propaganda obviously designed to affect the result of any election for President, Vice President, Presidential elector, Member of the Senate, or Member of the House of Representatives, or obviously calculated to create bias for or against a particular candidate in any such election, except as herein after provided.

Then the word "sponsored" is defined as not to include any sales at or through post exchanges, ship's service stores, or any other manner of distributing this literature by welfare funds or other nonappropriated funds of the armed forces.

The bill now pending contains a limitation that it shall expire 6 months after the war. I think there can be no objection to the insertion of section 2 in the pending bill, for I believe we should have a law, general in its scope, prohibiting the printing of such propaganda by the Government. In other words, I am of the opinion that the taxpayers' money should not be used for political propaganda, whether the propaganda is sent to the soldier at the front, or sent to the civilian here at home. We should have, and I hope we soon shall have, an act which will prohibit the Government printing political propaganda at the taxpayers' expense and distributing it here at home. The Government should not attempt by its own political propaganda to retain itself in office. That is true whether the propaganda goes to the soldier at the front or to the civilian at home.

Mr. President, with this explanation, I agree that there should be no restrictions upon what can be sent to the men of the fighting forces, and with the word of the Army and the Navy that the pending bill when passed will in no way restrict them, I voted in the committee to report the bill, and shall vote for the bill on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and also for another reason, I desire to say just a word at this time concerning the particular bill under consideration, and the original amendment which was adopted as an amendment to the soldiers' vote bill. That amendment, which was offered from the floor of the Senate, as I recall, amended a provision of the law which has come to bear my name, and from some sources I have been accused of being responsible for the passage of a measure which restricted the rights of the soldiers to receive information. I want to disavow any such connection or any such intention.

The original measure did go entirely too far, Mr. President. Not only by the interpretation placed upon it by the officials of the Army and the Navy, but by the terms of the bill itself, it acted as a limitation upon what the men in the armed forces of the Nation might read. To my mind, Mr. President, it is extremely bad legislation. It is bad for

the morale of the armed forces to set them apart in a class separate and distinct from the rest of the Nation, from those of us who are not fighting and who are not daily facing the dangers which confront every one of our soldiers. To say to those men, "You are patriotic enough, you are intelligent enough, to fight and die for your country, but we cannot trust you to read magazines and literature available to us," is to go beyond what I conceive to be the proper power of the legislative body.

Mr. President, I think the amendment to the soldiers' vote bill ought to be repealed in its entirety. I think no restriction should be placed upon the men in the armed services which is not placed upon civilians at home. I realize that probably the intention was not to limit or to restrict what the soldiers might read, but the amendment was adopted by reason of some fear that men charged with official responsibility, officials of the Army and the Navy, might use their power to promote political propaganda. It is a reflection on the intelligence of the men in the armed forces to contend or suggest that they cannot make proper distinction and ought not to have the privilege of reading even propaganda and drawing their own conclusions from it.

I repeat, if they are able to die for their country they ought to be able to form their own intelligent opinion from any source which they might desire.

Mr. President, I favor the outright repeal of the legislation, but in the committee this morning I did not press the point, because the pending bill, with its amendments, does obviate and correct most of the objections I have raised and which I have mentioned. As the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has rightly said; we were told in the committee this morning that the passage of this legislation would have just about the same effect as if the original amendment itself were repealed in its entirety. In order that the measure may be passed quickly, in order that the things which I have mentioned may be corrected, I consented in the committee to reporting the bill, and I do not object to its passage now, although I still think that the original provision should be repealed in its entirety.

Mr. President, I wish to make another suggestion which we discussed in the committee this morning, and to which the Senator from Michigan referred. If we are going to place restrictions at all with respect to Government-sponsored literature and broadcasts, or books, or anything sent to the armed forces, then identically the same restrictions should be placed upon the officials with respect to similar dissemination of literature and propaganda to the civilian population of the United States, and I am ready now, if we are going to make distinctions, if we are going to apply restrictions to officials of the Government in respect to what they send to the soldiers, to sponsor and agitate for a bill which will place exactly the same restrictions upon Government officials with respect to literature and broadcasts sent to the civilian population of this country.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to join the Senator in the sponsoring of such a bill which would restrict the dissemination of propaganda by Government officials, and make it a general law, universal in its scope, and not simply provide for the war period and for application only to the armed services.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Michigan that we discussed that matter in the committee, and also since we left the committee room this morning, and I hope we can shortly prepare such a bill, and have the Congress of the United States say to our boys overseas, "We are jealous concerning the things Government officials do. We do not want them to spend Government money for political purposes. That applies to all parties. But by the same token we will apply such restrictions to civilians and the members of the armed forces alike. We will not set apart the men who fight and attempt to provide some form of guardianship over them and regulate what they shall read."

Mr. President, as I previously said, I wished to make a brief explanation and give my own views concerning the subject. Because of the exigencies of the moment, rather than have a controversy take place over the proposals which have been suggested, and in order to let this corrective measure be passed now, and have the original bill corrected as quickly as possible, I shall not urge for further action today, but shall be glad to vote for the pending measure, so far as it goes in correcting the situation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I have been glad to join with the Senator from Rhode Island in preparing amendments to section 22 of the Hatch Act, which prohibits, under certain conditions, the distribution of Government-purchased or Government-sponsored propaganda to the armed forces. It is my opinion that these amendments are unnecessary, but I have joined in preparing them because of the unnecessarily restrictive interpretation placed on the act by the War Department and its Morale Division. The effect of the amendments will be to remove the possibility of continuing this restrictive interpretation and force the War Department to carry out the original intent of Congress. However, it may be some weeks before the House and the President can act on these amendments. In the meantime, I call upon the Secretary of War to see that the Morale Division adopts at once a reasonable interpretation of the law, without waiting for this final enactment. There has been no difficulty in the Navy, and I believe no justification for many of the positions which have been taken by the Army.

The purpose of the original act was a simple one, namely, to prevent the administration from using its monopoly of all channels of communication to the armed forces abroad to disseminate political propaganda designed or calculated to assist the President or any other candidate in the election. No one has suggested that such political propaganda

should be permitted. The War Department has not only interpreted the act in a nonsensical manner but it has given the public and the soldiers an entirely erroneous idea of what the act actually does. These are a few of the things that it does not do:

First. The act does not impose any censorship on letters to the armed forces, and such letters may carry political pamphlets, arguments or magazine articles, or anything else the sender wishes to enclose. Far from imposing a censorship, the act prohibits Army censors from removing any such matter. Yet, mothers are writing me daily protesting against some supposed censorship of letters.

Second. The act does not apply to anything except material paid for in whole or in part with Government funds, or sponsored by the Government. It therefore does not apply at all to sales on post exchanges, or to sales of newspapers by newsboys or others within the camps, as the War Department is now holding in England.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I prefer to finish, if the Senator does not mind.

Third. It does not apply at all to magazines or newspapers, if they are not sponsored by the Government; and even if they are, there is no limit on them in any way unless the Army itself is forced to limit the total number and make a selection. The act provides that the selection for printing or sponsoring shall be by a preference vote of the men, and not what the War Department chooses to hand them.

Fourth. It does not apply at all to the presentation of news if that news is of impartial coverage or presentation, as "news or information of public events and persons in public life."

Fifth. It does not apply to books of general circulation in the United States unless they are purchased by the Government. It therefore does not apply to secondhand books. It does apply to the selection of books by the Government for printing at Government expense. Few realize that the Government is printing 90,000 copies of 30 books every month. The act does require that the books bought or printed by the Government shall not contain political propaganda.

In my opinion, the whole trouble has arisen because of the War Department's interpretation of the act. It is significant that the Navy has had no difficulty whatever.

In the first place, the War Department issued a book of incomprehensible regulations which no commanding officer could interpret. It has ruled that sales on post exchanges, and even sales by newsboys within camps, in some way makes the publication sold a Government-sponsored publication. This is the basis for the ruling against British newspapers in England, and post-exchange sales of magazines and local newspapers in this country.

The difficulty about the British newspapers is based upon the theory that if the London Times is permitted to be sold at a post exchange in Great Britain the

United States Government becomes the sponsor of the publication. It seems to me that that is an utterly ridiculous interpretation of the act. The sale of a newspaper or magazine on a post exchange no more makes that magazine a Government-sponsored publication than the sale of Squibbs toothpaste makes it a Government-sponsored toothpaste. The War Department has gone so far as to forbid the use of company funds to buy current newspapers, such as the Los Angeles Times. The only basis for this ridiculous position is the claim that purchase with company funds makes this newspaper, sent to the company's captain through the mails, a United States Government-sponsored newspaper.

I have before me a letter from a captain who had ordered the Los Angeles Times for a Los Angeles unit in Texas. The letter was written to the Los Angeles Times, canceling the subscription, because the captain says that under the orders which he has received he must cancel the subscription. That is based upon the interpretation that because company funds are used to buy a Los Angeles newspaper of regular circulation, the Government of the United States is thereby made the sponsor of the publication, and therefore it must eliminate all political propaganda. I believe it is only necessary to state the interpretation to show how unreasonable the action of the War Department has been.

The War Department has attempted to censor magazines, if they do not receive a substantial number of votes in a poll taken among the soldiers. The act entirely exempts magazines of general circulation. The poll is intended to apply only if the Government must limit the magazines to be carried abroad or sponsor a list of magazines and print them at Government expense, as it is now doing.

The War Department has held that books like Charles A. Beard's *Republic* and *Yankee From Olympus*, a life of Mr. Justice Holmes, contain political propaganda. No reasonable man could make such a decision. I understand that *Yankee From Olympus* is barred because in a few lines on 1 page out of 300 an interview is reported between President Roosevelt and Justice Holmes on the latter's eightieth birthday, in which they expressed complimentary remarks to each other, to the effect that both of them were liberal leaders and contributing to the present liberal movement, or something of the kind.

I understand that no ruling has been made on motion-picture films. The only provision of the act is that if these are sponsored or paid for by the Government they shall be nonpartisan and nonpolitical. It may be that under the act prior to amendments the War Department's preliminary decision on the Wilson film is correct. At least I find the following editorial in the *Scripps-Howard Washington News*:

The first spectacular campaign document out of Hollywood in this election year has now been spread, with a shovel, before the public. It is the motion picture *Wilson*, a studied collection of liberal sentiments once expressed by America's First World War President, and woven into a clever and subtle

parallel with the words and operations of the Second World War President.

It is brilliantly executed and in the grand Hollywood manner and the bright colors on its screen are matched by the deep coloring of its history.

We suspect that it should be effective New Deal propaganda. For the present generation of voter, which never knew much about the Wilson era, will never suspect the elisions, the omissions, and the distortions by which the character of Woodrow Wilson has been so adroitly modeled into the image of Roosevelt.

If Twentieth Century-Fox should, by chance, have a box-office deficit—which is unlikely—the Democratic National Committee ought to make it up.

Certainly, if the War Department is going to buy and feed motion-picture films to the soldiers, they should not be political propaganda. The amendment adopted today, however, removes even that restriction, and only requires that the entire selection shall be impartial. I suppose that requirement would be met by throwing in two propaganda films, one on each side. However, since many other films are not shown to the soldiers because the Government does not buy them or export them, I should think even now it might be better to leave out of a limited selection the ones that are clearly political propaganda. I might add that since then it appears that the War Department says it never did ban the Wilson film, and that the film never was presented to it. But someone in the War Department gave out the publicity, in connection with the general attack on the law, that it had banned the Wilson film. It appears this morning, from the evidence, that it is a film which could not be selected under any circumstances, because the Army has means of showing technicolor films in only one or two places over the world. Furthermore, the film requires over 2 hours to show, so that it is a longer film than the War Department can possibly handle. Why someone chose to give out the information, I cannot possibly understand.

Some point has been made of the exclusion of an Official Guide to the American Air Force, because it carried President Roosevelt's picture, as Commander in Chief. It is not quite clear why an official guide to the American Air Force is any better guide by reason of the Roosevelt picture. One reason for the law was the fact that prior to its enactment, all the literature sent abroad seemed to be full of Roosevelt's picture, just as are the billboards in this country devoted to the selling of bonds. There is no way I know of that any publication carrying Governor Dewey's picture can be sent to the soldiers, except through individual letters. Certainly the War Department is not trying to do so.

I do not think most people realize, Mr. President, how completely the Army dominates the information received by the soldiers abroad. Unlike during the World War, it is impossible for anyone to reach the soldiers abroad except through the War Department or through private letters. If a book is sent abroad attacking me personally or any other Senator, there is no possible way by which I or any other Senator can answer such

charges or can write the soldiers in any volume. Just think of the scope of the present Army program.

The Army is distributing free, each month, to soldiers, 4,000,000 copies of American magazines, many of them printed by the Government itself, at Government expense. It is distributing free, each month, two and a half million books, distributed at Government expense.

It publishes, through Government-appointed editors, *Yank* and *Stars and Stripes*, as well as 2,000 other daily or weekly magazines or station newspapers. It selects and distributes news to be sent daily by a Signal Corps wireless, short-wave radio, cable, and air mail. The Government broadcasts daily 30 times, during the day and night, newscasts via a short-wave radio. It circulates news reels and films prepared by the morale division, as well as others which it selects from those offered by motion-picture producers. It provides each week 1 hour of duty time for informing all military personnel of the issues and course of the war. Certainly that affords an unusual opportunity to present a picture of issues and, of course, also of politics.

No Government has ever had such complete control over the information reaching 5,000,000 voters. It is essential that this tremendous power be handled in an impartial manner. Otherwise it gives a control over the thinking of the soldiers such as Hitler himself would envy. The interpretation of the act by the War Department has been so unreasonable that many persons have suggested to me that the course pursued by the War Department and its Morale Division is deliberately intended to discredit Congress in order to affect the election. Mr. David Lawrence, in the *United States News* of this week, says:

One is reluctant to believe that the War Department is trying to elect Mr. Roosevelt for a fourth term, yet the narrow view taken of the existing provisions of the law prevents a wide dissemination in the Army of the news of the political campaign, which means, of course, that the Roosevelt candidacy will benefit.

This doubt about the War Department's impartiality is not new. Its representatives cooperated 100 percent with the extreme New Dealers and the C. I. O. Political Action Committee in support of a clearly unconstitutional Federal ballot carrying no names except those of the candidates for President. The Department has now set up an organization to get out the vote, extending to the smallest units, on a scale which no political organization could possibly duplicate among the civilian population. I suggest that the War Department prove its impartiality by rescinding at once, without waiting for the final passage of these amendments, the unreasonable regulations by which it has attempted to censor the information going to the soldiers.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I am afraid I did not understand the remark of the able senior

Senator from Ohio about those who favored the so-called soldiers' vote bill.

Mr. TAFT. I said the War Department had from the beginning—and that was how this whole controversy arose originally—cooperated 100 percent. It raised no constitutional question. It went right along with the soldiers' vote bill, with the Federal ballot, from the very beginning. It cooperated. All the influence it had—I do not say it exercised a great deal—was used in favor of the soldiers' vote bill. It never occurred to the War Department that any constitutional question was involved. So I have felt from the beginning that the War Department strongly favored the plan of soldiers' voting by Federal ballot, which plan originally contained, as will be remembered, provisions for the printing of just the names of Roosevelt and his opponent, without the names of any Senators or Representatives or anyone else who might be a candidate in the election. The War Department seems to be interested only in the presidential election.

Mr. PEPPER. But the able Senator seems to overlook the fact that the proposed ballot was to provide a blank space in which not only the names of other candidates for President but also the names of candidates for Senator and for other offices might be entered.

Mr. TAFT. Oh, yes; it afforded a great deal of blank space.

Mr. PEPPER. Did the Senator say that those who favored the bill were acting with the C. I. O. and its Political Action Committee?

Mr. TAFT. Not at all. I said the War Department apparently took the view of the C. I. O. in favoring its passage.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator has not determined whether the soldiers believe that will give them a better opportunity to vote, has he?

Mr. TAFT. No; I have had no opportunity to consult with soldiers.

As a matter of fact, the idea that the bill the Congress passed would in any way limit them is completely in error. From Hamilton County, Ohio, there have already been sent 8,000 State ballots, and 12,000 have been sent from the city of Cleveland. I think the charge that there is going to be any limit on voting is entirely disproved as a result of the applications made to date for State ballots.

Mr. PEPPER. Has the able Senator been able to make any study or to obtain any information as to how many soldiers and sailors from the State of New York will be permitted to vote in the general election under the law to which they will be subject?

Mr. TAFT. Every one of them who sends in the post card, as I understand, will be able to vote.

Mr. PEPPER. Has the Senator seen the general comment in the press about the relatively small number of servicemen from the State of New York who will be privileged to vote, as compared with the number of soldiers and sailors from the State of New Jersey who will be able to vote?

Mr. TAFT. No; I have not seen that. Such comment is incorrect. Servicemen from New York will have exactly the same opportunity to vote as will servicemen from Ohio. I see no reason why, among the soldiers and sailors from each of those States, there will not be the same percentage who will vote. I saw that the C. I. O.'s Political Action Committee called on Governor Dewey and has been trying to make a political issue with him on this question. That is the only comment I saw in the press.

Mr. PEPPER. Did the able Senator hear very much comment from Governor Dewey about the Federal ballot? He did not favor the Federal ballot when the question was under debate in the Senate, did he?

Mr. TAFT. No, and neither did I; and none can be used in New York, and none can be used in Ohio. Under that law servicemen from some States can use the Federal ballot if they send for State ballots but do not receive them by the 1st of October. I understand that if that occurs, under the provisions made by some States the soldier may then vote the Federal ballot. Massachusetts and California are the largest States, apparently, which will permit that to be done.

I may say that the regulations adopted by the Army provide that the Federal ballots shall be at hand, and that the moment the 1st of October comes every captain and every other commanding officer is supposed to rush out to all his men and to say to them, "Here is the Federal ballot. Did you get your State ballot? If not, be sure not to miss voting, and vote this ballot." That is the effect of the regulations of the Army. I do not say it is illegal. I merely say the Army seems to be unduly anxious that the very moment the State ballot fails to arrive on the 1st of October, everyone who can possibly vote shall get a Federal ballot in his hands and shall be instructed to vote it—I do not mean that he shall be instructed for whom to vote, but that he will be instructed to carry out the process of voting it.

Mr. PEPPER. I wonder if the machinery with respect to voting in the general election under the State laws and voting in the primary elections is not pretty much the same. If it is, I wonder if the November election in the State of Ohio will not result in a larger percentage of servicemen voting than those who voted in the primary election under the State law of my State. In my State, which has approximately 200,000 men in the service, approximately 10,000 ballots were sent out, and less than 6,000 ballots were returned by the soldiers. So under the machinery which is the preferred machinery of those who do not call themselves New Dealers, and are not in sympathy with the C. I. O. Political Action Committee, as the able Senator from Ohio has expressed it, which machinery some have been so solicitous in preserving, in my State if the general election works out in the way in which the primary election worked out—and it is analogous, I believe, in regulation—out of about 200,000 soldiers only about 10,000 actually will receive ballots and

not more than 8,000 will actually vote. If that is the way the process will work out throughout the country in November, the practical effect of what Senators have been so solicitous to bring about will be that the servicemen who are fighting for the existence of this country will, as a practical matter, not be allowed to vote.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator is entirely mistaken. The Ohio ballot was ready the 1st of August. On that day in Hamilton County, where a total of 200,000 votes is usually cast, about 8,000 applications for service ballots had already been received. They are still coming in in large numbers. In Cleveland, a city of comparable size, about 12,000 applications for ballots have been received. I expect that there will be a very large servicemen's vote. The interest on the part of many persons with regard to primary elections has been practically negligible. The soldiers were not interested. They did not know who was running in the primaries. I do not believe that the result of a primary election has any bearing on the question of what the vote will be in the general election in November.

Mr. PEPPER. I have in my possession an editorial from the Chicago Sun in which the able Senator from Ohio is quoted with reference to the soldiers' ballot. The editorial contains a statement to the effect that in time of war, when soldiers are away and cannot keep closely informed about the issues of a political campaign, the Senator from Ohio doubts in a large degree the wisdom of soldiers voting. Did the Senator from Ohio ever take such a position?

Mr. TAFT. I did not, and the statement which appeared in the Saturday Review of Literature, a strange political comment, is contradicted in the current number of that publication. I made no such statement as has been attributed to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Utah in the Chair). The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2050) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RESTRICTION OF IMMIGRATION—ACQUISITION OF CERTAIN BASES

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, a few days ago the Senate had under consideration a bill sponsored by the able and distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] who is present in the Chamber at this time. While the bill was being discussed I offered a number of amendments, one of which would prohibit any alien from serving in an administrative capacity under the bill. The Members of this body accepted that amendment. I hope that when the bill goes to conference the conferees will leave that amendment in the bill, because I do not think that any alien ought to be paid by the American taxpayers to administer the provisions of any bill

which we have inaugurated in this legislative body.

At the same time, Mr. President, I offered an amendment which reads as follows:

After the date of enactment of this act, and until the expiration of 5 years after the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, no immigration visa shall be issued to any immigrant.

In other words, the provision would set up bars against any alien from any part of the world coming into the United States. I asked for the yeas and nays on the amendment, but my request was not seconded by a sufficient number of Senators to enable me to obtain a yeas and nays vote. As a result we merely had a voice vote, and the amendment which I offered, which would bar all aliens from this country for a period of 5 years after the termination of the present war, was rejected by this body.

There was brought to my attention this morning an article which appeared in the Evening Star of last Saturday, August 12, under the headline "Italians Are Hopeful United States Will Relax Its Immigration Quota."

I shall not take the time of the Senate to read the entire article, but I hope that every reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will take time to do so. It informs us that hundreds of thousands of Italians want to come to the United States, want to make their homes here. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ITALIANS ARE HOPEFUL UNITED STATES WILL RELAX ITS IMMIGRATION QUOTA

ROME, August 4.—In every corner of liberated Italy today, Italians ask the same hopeful question: "Will we be able to go to the United States after the war?"

And it doesn't come from just the disillusioned, bitter youth who are unable to see any future in this war-ravaged land. Middle-aged men—professional men—say: "We want to get out of here. We want to go to America."

So the truth is that countless Italians are sick of Italy—for political as well as economic reasons—and they pin their hopes on a new life overseas.

SCORE QUOTA SYSTEM

Emigration consequently is sure to be one of the burning issues in post-war Italy and the Italian press already has begun to call for a scrapping of the quota system, whereby less than 4,000 Italian emigrants were allowed to enter the United States each year.

Here are some of the arguments they give for a revision of this system:

1. A victorious United States will be the only country in the world to which a war-torn humanity will be able to turn for commodities and supplies for at least 10 years. This will mean a tremendous increase in American production and a consequent need for labor. Italian labor knows no peer.

2. With all the reconstruction that will be necessary in Italy, the country will be unable to employ all of its labor potential. Italy is rich in human quantity, but poor in natural resources. The surplus labor can be put to work in America, producing the materials necessary to reconstruct Italy.

3. Before 1914 more than 200,000 Italian workmen went to the United States every year. From those immigrants came a steady

stream of money which rejuvenated the Italian treasury. The Italian treasury now certainly needs rejuvenation.

4. American organized labor opposed mass immigration after the World War on the grounds that the labor market would be swamped, but the devastation wrought in Europe by this war is so great that American industry would be able to employ every available workman to produce the materials for reconstruction. There will be work and bread for all.

NECESSARY EVIL

Italian lawyers on emigration have treated the subject exclusively from the economic viewpoint—as a necessary evil. If you talk to individual Italians, however, you find that many of them want to go to America so that "I will be left alone," and so that "I will have some freedom." Many of them predict that the Italians will start shooting each other just as soon as the Allies leave and they are too tired, too cynical, and too disillusioned to take part in it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, we shall find that after the war is over hundreds of thousands of individuals from all over the world, aliens will want to come to the United States; they will want to come to the United States because we actually have in practice here, and, I might add, in enjoyment, the "four freedoms." The great masses of our laboring people enjoy better living conditions than are enjoyed by the laboring people of any other nation of the world. I want to keep it that way. It strikes me as ridiculous, when we are called upon to vote billions of dollars to take care of the unemployed people we shall have in this country when the war ends, that at the same time we permit any alien—I do not care who he is or where he is from—to come into this country. Why should our overburdened and impoverished taxpayers be called upon to dig deeper into their pockets and take out the little they have left to support people who are not American citizens? I have protested against it many times on the floor of the Senate, and I protest against it again. I shall continue to protest, because I think it is unfair that the American taxpayer should be called upon to provide jobs, maintenance, or charity for people in the United States who are not Americans, or for the hundreds of thousands who will come here immediately after the war is over.

Notwithstanding anything we may say, we shall have many unemployed after the war. Millions of our people are working in war plants, millions whose hands are engaged daily in the production of material for our men and women who are fighting at the fronts all over the world. When this war ends those jobs will end. When this war ends the money will cease to flow. When this war ends our real troubles will begin.

I insist that American workers and American soldiers, both men and women, should have American jobs; and I insist that it is our duty to preserve every single job in this country for American citizens.

As stated in the article which I have had printed in the RECORD, thousands of Italians want to come to this country. We shall find the same thing happening in the case of citizens of almost every other country of the world. We shall not only find people wanting to come

from the European countries, but after we shall have defeated Japan, we shall find people wanting to come from all parts of the Orient.

Once upon a time we had a law known as the Chinese exclusion law, prohibiting orientals from coming into this country; but not long ago Congress repealed that law against orientals. I voted against the repeal of the law, because I knew that if we repealed the law pertaining to China, every one of the oriental countries would demand that its people be afforded the same courtesy and the same privilege. Already mass meetings have been held demanding that other orientals be granted the same privilege which the Chinese were given when we repealed the Chinese exclusion law. So much for that, Mr. President.

Our distinguished colleague from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] brought to the attention of this body today a subject which has been of much interest to me for a number of years. Before discussing that subject I wish to reread the resolution which he has submitted, which relates to the acquisition of islands in the Atlantic and in the Pacific, with a view to protecting continental United States. I am interested in that subject, because the only country upon the face of the earth in which I am vitally and fundamentally interested is the United States of America. When I make that statement I realize that it may be said—and it has been said—that those who are poor Americans, those who are always talking about keeping immigrants out of our country and looking after the United States exclusively, are the "underground" at the present time. I care nothing about that smear. The smear word "isolationist" was used prior to the time we got into this war. I make no apologies to anyone for being interested primarily in the United States of America.

I am interested in the resolution submitted by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, which has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, so ably presided over by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. Connally], a great American who is loved and respected by all of us.

The resolution submitted today by the Senator from Tennessee reads as follows:

Resolved, That, in order to promote and protect the peace and security of the United States, it is the sense of the Senate.

(1) That any treaty or agreement terminating the present war against Japan or settling the questions arising out of such war should provide that the United States shall have and retain as its permanent possessions all islands which on December 5, 1941, were in the possession of or mandated to Japan and which lie between the Equator and the thirtieth parallel of latitude north, including Formosa and the Ryukyu Islands.

(2) That, in settling the questions arising out of the present wars and in making provisions for the maintenance of peace, the United States should acquire as its permanent possessions Bermuda Island and all islands in the West Indies which are now the possessions of European nations.

Resolved further, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to enter into negotiations with the Republic of Ecuador with a view to obtaining the Galapagos Islands as permanent possessions of the United States.

I believe that the resolution embodies an excellent idea. I shall be more than happy to discuss with my colleagues who are also members of the Committee on Foreign Relations the proposals contained in the resolution, because they are in the interest of the national defense of the United States.

I remember that a number of years ago I introduced in this body a joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to enter into negotiations with both France and England with a view to acquiring the islands owned by the British and the French in the North Atlantic; but no attention was paid to it at that time. I suggested that the President inquire into that matter to ascertain the appraised value of those islands, with a view to deducting the appraised value of the islands from the debt which was due us from Great Britain and France as a result of World War No. 1. I am happy to know that my distinguished colleague from Tennessee agrees with me that in order to provide the right sort of protection for this portion of the Western Hemisphere, the North American Continent, we should have those possessions in the Atlantic. I go further than he does in his resolution. I go further than Bermuda. I think we ought to take Bimini and Nassau, opposite Miami and only about 50 miles off the coast of Florida. I think we should take Jamaica. We should not only take the islands which belong to the British there, but we should discuss the appraised value of those islands and deduct their value from what Great Britain owes us as a result of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2.

Furthermore, in view of the fact that we are going to be called upon to reconquer, reclaim, and redeliver the Dutch East Indies to the Dutch Government, I think we should make an appraisal of the island of Curaçao, which is just north of Venezuela, in the Atlantic Ocean, and is a most important post insofar as protection of the Panama Canal is concerned. Whatever the value of that island may be found to be, we should deduct that from what the Dutch Government will owe us for reconquering and redelivering to them the Dutch East Indies in the far-away Orient.

Insofar as our brothers of France are concerned, they are now very grateful for all the assistance we have given them. I think we should ask them to let us have the two small islands which lie directly off the coast of Newfoundland, the islands of St. Pierre and Miquelon. They are quite small, the larger of the two being only approximately 15 miles long and possibly a mile and a half or two miles wide. But we could use them to good advantage in defending our northern coasts. We should have them appraised; and after the amount of the appraisal is determined, we should deduct that from the amount which France owes us as a result of World War No. 1 and what she will owe us as a result of World War No. 2.

And if possible we should make some agreement of a friendly nature to get a

portion of, or to establish some sort of bases in, Greenland and Iceland.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, later on I shall undertake to express the views I have concerning these matters. I submitted the resolution today, I will say to the Senator, for the purpose of letting it be known what some of us in America think should be done. In my opinion, one of the greatest misfortunes which ever overtook our country was when we turned the island outposts in the Pacific over to Japan, to be held by her in trust for all of the then Allies. Instead of holding them in trust, she took them for herself, and by reason of them she was able to attack us.

So far as the islands near the Panama Canal, both in the Atlantic and in the Pacific, are concerned, by reason of our experience with the islands in the Pacific, we should know that it will be absolutely necessary in the future, for the protection of the Panama Canal, which we own and which we built, for us to have those islands. We must have those islands, both those in the Atlantic and those in the Pacific.

There may be other islands, in addition to those I have named in the Pacific, which we should have. It may be that we should have some of the islands farther north. But if so, the resolution can easily be amended so as to make provision for that.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Certainly.

Mr. President, I was particularly interested in what the Senator had to say in his resolution in regard to the Galápagos Islands, which are off the coast of Ecuador. They are very important to our defense, both in the South Pacific, and the middle Pacific, and the Pacific. It is well that the Senator named those islands. They are of such physical structure that they could most advantageously be used. I think that suggestion on the part of the Senator was a very fine one.

I rather imagine that the Senator, in considering the protection of the Panama Canal, possibly had in mind the acquisition of Cocos Island, which is off the coast of Costa Rica, and is owned by Costa Rica.

Mr. McKELLAR. All the islands in the Atlantic and in the Pacific, near the Panama Canal, are included.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think that is excellent.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield to the able junior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I wish to refresh the recollection of my friend the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs. He will remember that he appointed a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs to view the islands in the Atlantic and in the Pacific. If we are to obtain possession of some of the islands on which we have spent millions of dollars for installations erected on

other people's property, and if we are going to get any benefit from the \$25,000,000,000 of lend-lease which has already been announced—

Mr. McKELLAR. And also any benefit from the expenditure of the lives of our soldiers.

Mr. CHANDLER. Yes. If we are to do that, then we shall have to have a complete rearrangement of the lives and affairs of the people of the United States.

After the last war we said we did not want anything, and we did not get anything. Under the Smuts plan these islands were mandated to Japan and to other nations. We refused to accept any mandates. Now and for some time past in the Pacific, American boys have been losing their lives in winning back islands which were mandated to Japan or to some weak friendly nation which could not protect them when the show-down came.

It will be absolutely foolish for the American people in the future to agree that possession of such islands may be had by any of our allies who may not be able to defend them when the time of the show-down comes, with the result that some enemy will be able to take them over. We must say to them that we are going to have possession of every island in every ocean which, if in the possession of an enemy, would be a direct menace to the people of the United States. We must have direct ownership of all islands which, if in the hands of a weak friend, could not be protected by that friend when the show-down comes. We have spent our blood, our treasure, and our time in driving the enemy out of these islands, and the American people are entitled to that protection in the future. To say that in the future we cannot have possession of islands which anchor the protection of our supply lines to various parts of the Pacific, including Australia, is absolutely foolish.

We are already committed, I wish to say to my dear friend the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, under the Monroe Doctrine to defend all the people and territories of South America against any nation that might undertake to establish itself there. Then, around the western rim, we are entitled to equal access and opportunity of trade into the areas we are to defend.

A subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs recommended a long time ago that we are entitled to rights to these bases and access to these bases—to something more in respect to the millions of dollars worth of property we have built on the property of other nations than the right to get out when the war is over.

That is a simple proposition, one which should be viewed realistically, and one which we are bound to consider seriously, under our obligations to the people of the United States, in view of the great expenditure of lives and money which we have made in their protection.

I assure the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from North Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, that I will be with them when

the showdown comes, and will be one of the supporters of the policy by which we will say to the nations interested, "We want you to give consideration at this time to giving us an opportunity to protect the people of the United States in the future."

I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the Senator's statement has certainly been a fine one. I know the Senator from Tennessee is greatly encouraged by it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Indeed, I am.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I know the Senator is. Several Senators earlier today, after the Senator from Tennessee submitted his resolution, told me they were vitally interested in it. One Senator told the Senator from Tennessee and me that he would make a speech on the Senator's measure, in favor of it, later today. All that is very encouraging.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, some of us have visited and observed these places. We have been there at the direction of the Senate and at the direction of the Senate's committees. I join in the assertion the President made in the speech he delivered the other day from the State of Washington that it is necessary to view these things. If we do see them, we recognize at once the right of the American people to have an opportunity, in justice, to support proper measures.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I recall with much gratification that some time ago I, as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, appointed the able and distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] as a member of a committee of five to make a trip around the world. I am very happy that such an opportunity was accorded to me, because on numerous occasions I have observed that, in making the trip, the committee performed a service of great value to this country.

Before leaving the subject of the Atlantic Ocean, I wish to say that Argentina is a long way from here. We seem to have gotten into a little quarrel with the people of Argentina. That is unfortunate. But there are a couple of vast areas of land lying just north of Brazil which belong to the French and to the British. By the way, the third parcel and portion of land belongs to the Dutch. There are three different countries located on the coast. One belongs to the British, one to the Dutch, and one to the French. All of them owe money to the United States, and we might respectfully request of them that they let us have such coastal areas of those respective lands as we may want for our protection and for the protection of our brothers in the southern portion of this hemisphere against designs of a foreign enemy.

I wish now to proceed to the subject of the Pacific Ocean. The acquisition of the Galápagos Islands, off the coast of Ecuador, is necessary to the best interests of this country. The Ecuadorans are very fine people. I have found those in charge of their Government at Quito, their capital, to be very friendly persons who really appreciate our friendship. I

believe that they could be shown that it would be to their advantage for us to be the possessors of the Galápagos Islands, not only so that we could look after our own interests in the southern Pacific and in the middle Pacific but their interests in the Pacific as well.

In previous discussions I have suggested that it might be well for us to take up with our brothers of Mexico the matter of the acquisition of what is known as Southern California. It is an arid section. It is not very densely populated. There is a large and deep body of water lying between the peninsula and the mainland of Mexico. In that water a fleet could almost be hidden and certainly submarine bases could be established. We should enter into negotiations with our sister republic for the acquisition of Southern California for the protection of Mexico and for the protection of the United States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not know what the legal situation would be in Ecuador. But the constitution of Mexico contains a provision prohibiting the country from selling any of the sovereign property of Mexico to any foreign government, irrespective of the merits, good will—

Mr. REYNOLDS. And the benefits.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And the benefits involved.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator very much.

Of course, this subject brings us to the Hawaiian Islands where we are now protected in that part of the world. The able Senator from Tennessee has mentioned a resolution with reference to Formosa, and islands which were mandated to Japan after World War No. 1.

However, while I am on the subject, I wish to mention Alaska. It is my recollection that prior to the trip around the world by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] and his four colleagues, constituting the committee to which I have referred, the Senator from Kentucky personally made a trip to the Aleutian Islands.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I hope that the Senator from Michigan will pay particular attention to what I am about to say.

In view of the recent speech of the President with reference to the situation in Alaska during the time of the Japanese invasion of the Aleutian Islands, I think it is not out of place for me modestly to suggest that perhaps the two speeches which I made last year with respect to the war in the Pacific were not wholly out of place or in error. The Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Maryland, as well as others, were nice enough on those occasions to express approval of the speeches which I made. I think that the events which have happened since then show quite clearly that the Japanese were strongly entrenched in the Aleutians. As the President has said, it took quite an operation to remove them.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the Senator very much. I am reminded by the reference to his visit to Alaska that I was there in 1938. I was all over Alaska. As a matter of fact, I was on the revenue cutter which conveyed the stone which was to mark the place of death, so to speak, of Will Rogers and Wiley Post. I refer to Point Barrow. Will Rogers and Wiley Post lost their lives about 15 miles from there. I went all over Alaska at that time and all over the Aleutians. When I returned home I made a number of talks and expressed some views with regard to the necessity of fortifications in the Aleutians and increasing the fortifications in Alaska.

More than 5 years ago, Mr. President, I suggested that we should immediately begin construction of a highway from Fairbanks to the United States, by way of British Columbia. I stated that if we started the construction of the highway during peacetime we could complete it for approximately \$25,000,000, and that it would be traversable during all seasons of the year. But, unfortunately, the people of the United States did not agree with my views, and nothing was done. When we came to the point where we had to do something we built a highway through Canada which has cost more than \$75,000,000 to construct, and portions of which will never be kept in good traversable condition because of the conditions involved. I wish to point out that in 1938, on the floor of this body, I insisted that the fortifications in Alaska should be strengthened.

Mr. President, I wish to conclude by saying that I hope, when the resolution of the able Senator from Tennessee is considered by the Foreign Relations Committee, that the committee at that time will consider a resolution which I have submitted, which has been referred to that committee. It relates to Wrangel Island. If one flies today from New York to Manila, the capital of the Philippine Commonwealth, he will fly directly over Wrangel Island. If he were to fly to many parts of the Orient he would fly in the neighborhood of Wrangel Island. After the war has come to an end and air transportation is greatly increased throughout the world, I believe that Wrangel Island will be one of the most important military bases in the world insofar as we are concerned. As I have already said, Mr. President, Wrangel Island is in the Arctic. It is north of Little Diomedé, which we own. The Russians own Big Diomedé, which is about a mile from Little Diomedé in the Arctic.

Wrangel Island is about the same size as Jamaica. Planes landing there naturally have to land and take off on skis. But it will be a very important point, and I hope that the committee will take into consideration my resolution which calls for the United States at this time to look into the question of ownership of Wrangel Island. We discovered Wrangel Island. An expedition from this country was there about the year 1860. The party became ice-bound, but a few of its members got to the island and planted on it the first flag of any

nation in the world. The American flag was planted on that island. No one questioned our ownership of it for a number of years. Finally we sent there about half a dozen of our Alaskan Eskimos, one Chinese, and one white American. But something happened to them. They were either taken off or died, and since then it is my understanding that Russia claims that it is her island and she has men there now. Now, while we are in good relations with our allies, when we are all friendly and hugging and kissing and shaking hands with one another in good spirit, is the time to take this matter up with Russia; now is the time to take it up with France, Great Britain, the Netherlands, and all other countries interested.

Mr. President, I am really indebted to the Senator from Tennessee for bringing this matter up now because it is of great importance to the future defense of the United States of America. If we have those defenses in the Atlantic and Pacific, I pray God that never again will we be called upon to send the sons and daughters of American fathers and mothers to any foreign land in any part of the world to fight any war or in any war.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, before the Senator from North Carolina leaves the floor I should like to ask him a question respecting procedure. I think Senators ought to be entitled, so far as possible, to know what the legislative program with respect to reconversion legislation is to be for the remainder of the week. I wish to ask the Senator in his capacity as chairman of the Military Affairs Committee when, in the light of the situation as it stands today, there is calculated to be a report to the Senate from his committee on the question of surplus property as one of the aspects of reconversion.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I am very happy to have an opportunity to answer the Senator from Michigan. I do not think that the committee will be ready to report a bill in its final form to this body before next Monday. We are to meet again tomorrow morning at 10:30, at which time we will hear Mr. Ickes and former Representative Maverick, of Texas, who is now at the head of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. They will probably take up the greater part of the morning. We will meet in executive session tomorrow afternoon, and will probably be meeting every morning and every afternoon for several days. We have had made final prints of the Stewart bill and the Murray bill, and they will be on the desk of every member of the Military Affairs Committee tomorrow morning. But I feel confident that we will not be in a position to report a bill before next Monday.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I agree with the Senator. I think it will be practically impossible for the committee to have a bill ready for the consideration of the Senate before next Monday.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, does the Senator think it will be ready next Monday?

Mr. HILL. If the Senator is addressing his question to me, and if the Senator from North Carolina will yield, I think there is a very good possibility that the bill will be ready next Monday. But I would say this about it: It was my purpose to move a recess until Friday, and certainly I should say that by Friday we ought to know better what the situation is and whether the bill will be ready by Monday. I should know, however, that there is a good possibility that the bill will be ready by Monday.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is illuminating the point I wanted to make as clear as possible. If the Senator is going to move that the Senate take a recess until Friday and there is no possibility of bringing any final reconversion legislation before the Senate until Monday, then it would seem to me that the able acting leader should be able to say to Senators that there is nothing essentially holding them here for the remainder of the week or until next Monday. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. I will say to the Senator that is correct. I know of nothing that should hold Senators here during the remainder of the present week so far as any consideration or action by the Senate is concerned.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I feel that the way to be sure of the presence of Senators when we need them is to be frank with them when we do not need them.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. I know of no need for the presence of Senators for the remainder of the week so far as the work of the Senate itself is concerned.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to add that in saying there is no need for Senators to be here for the remainder of the week, I do not want to give the idea that Senators ought not to be here next week and ought not to be here on Monday. As I have said, on Friday we will perhaps know better as to whether the committee will be ready to report Monday, or if not Monday, then what day; but I certainly do not want to give any idea that there will not be need for Senators to be present in the Chamber in their seats next week.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is the precise purpose of my inquiry, because obviously I am one of those who think that the Senate must complete the reconversion program, and I am very eager, so far as those upon this side of the aisle are concerned, that they all be here when the occasion requires. I am making my inquiry only so that we may be sure of the type of instructions we can send out to our colleagues in respect to when they are needed. I certainly agree they are needed next week, if there is any possibility of a report from the committee at that time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. I think we will have a report ready on Monday.

THE BORROWING OF EXPERTS BY CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, during the closing moments of the debate last Thursday afternoon on the proposed legislation contained in the Kilgore-Murray-Truman bill, there ensued a rather sharp colloquy between the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Kilgore] and myself relative to the borrowing and the loaning of experts to legislative committees.

I do not choose to hold post mortems after a battle has been fought nor do I desire to engage the senior Senator from West Virginia in further colloquy on the loaning and borrowing of so-called experts, but I do wish to point out to the Members of the Senate that since the point of order was made on August 9, scores of editorials have been written about the abuse of the loaning of experts. Among them appeared an editorial published in the Washington Post on August 12, 1944, which very forcefully and constructively deals with this situation.

It is entitled "Problem of Experts." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEM OF EXPERTS

The ruckus created by the alleged close contact between the expert "on loan" from the W. P. B. who claims to have drafted the Kilgore bill and the C. I. O.'s Political Action Committee emphasizes the need of a trained staff permanently attached to congressional committees and paid for out of funds appropriated for that purpose. Committees of the House and Senate inadequately supplied with funds to conduct investigations and formulate legislative programs have fallen into the bad habit of borrowing experts from Federal executive agencies and sometimes from private employers. These individuals may be in possession of valuable information and useful contacts. But all too often their approach to the legislative problems under consideration is biased by the fact that they are in the pay of others.

Even if borrowed investigators succeed in being fair and impartial in their judgments, they are suspect if their regular jobs have brought them into close contact with any of the groups likely to be injured or benefited by the legislation they are helping to draft. Thus it becomes the responsibility of congressional committees to pick their experts with exceeding care to guard against the possibility that they may "grind other axes." When experts are borrowed here and there in penny-pinching attempts to save money, the committees lay themselves open to deserved criticism.

The only way to avoid such criticism is to engage experts hired on a full-time basis at satisfactory rates of pay. A permanent staff of competent assistants might, for instance, be built up through expansion of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. That agency is already performing useful work, despite a severely limited budget and a small staff. The creation of a permanent organization to give expert aid to congressional committees would not obviate the need for advice from persons employed by the executive branch of government. For many of these bureaucratic experts are outstanding authorities in their special fields of knowledge, and can render invaluable aid in helping to mold legislative opinion.

Nor would a group of experts detailed to serve Congress be expected to isolate themselves from contact with private groups whose opinions and suggestions might help to determine the character of legislative programs. A committee aide who was afraid to be seen conversing with representatives of the C. I. O., the A. F. of L., or any other labor group wouldn't be worth his salt to a committee struggling with labor legislation. It is only when contacts are the actual or suspected result of under-cover affiliations between the experts and the groups interrogated that trouble arises.

The executive branch has already gone very far in according official recognition to group or class interests by appointing to office men selected to represent big and small business and this or that labor organization or farm group. We think this trend is unfortunate because the first duty of every Government official is to further the general public interest above all special interests. Certainly it is the paramount duty of congressional committees to place the interests of all the people above that of any part of the people. Hence, in turning to Government officials for guidance committee members would do well to give a wide berth to those officials who are protagonists of special causes. Legislative programs, whatever their special purpose, are supposed to further the general welfare and must be fitted within this large framework of reference, if Congress is to retain its character as a really representative body. Balanced legislation is jeopardized by relying upon the advice and assistance of "borrowed" experts who, whether from conviction or because of their professional affiliations, are special pleaders.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish also to call to the attention of Members of the Senate the fact that I have received scores of telephone calls and communications commenting upon the loaning and borrowing of experts and their close association with outside interests. If only a part of these charges is true, it is amazing and indicates a dire need for an immediate investigation.

Remembering the admonition of the able majority leader the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] recently upon the floor of the Senate to the effect that too many congressional investigations are now being made, I have sought out a permanently organized committee which I feel is authorized and well qualified to make such an investigation.

On August 12, 1944, I addressed a communication to Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, the junior Senator from Virginia, Chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, requesting an investigation of the loaning of experts and the invasion of the privileges of the floor by representatives of outside interests.

I now ask unanimous consent that a copy of this communication be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. The letter is self-explanatory.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 12, 1944.

HON. HARRY F. BYRD,

Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: On August 9, while the Senate was in session, I made a point of order relative to one who is not a member of the Senate assuming the privilege of the floor and speaking to the Senator who was the

Presiding Officer at that period of the Senate session. The Presiding Officer said that, technically, the point of order was well made.

But should the incident stop there?

For the past several months, it has come to my attention that in important sessions of the Senate, numerous so-called experts have been seated in the rear of the Senate Chamber as well as flanking Senators in their seats. I wish to call to your attention that yesterday afternoon, I counted more than 31 persons who were not Members of the Senate, standing along the walls of the Senate Chamber.

Who are these men?

Where do they come from?

Whom do they represent?

Are they there as congressional officers, serving the United States Senate in the interest of the general public? Or are they attempting to lobby legislation through the Senate in behalf of special interests?

There could be no objection to the so-called experts of many governmental agencies making a study of legislation and presenting it to the authorized representatives of the Senate in the proper manner; they should also be permitted in their research to gain any legislative information possible—but that is an entirely different thing from preparing legislation and invading the Senate floor to direct its procedure in attempting to pass the legislation in the United States Senate.

Since I made the point of order as cited above, I have had numerous telephone calls and other communications giving me data and statistics. If even a part of these reports is true, it is amazing and indicates a dire need for an immediate investigation.

Because you are the chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures, I am directing this request for an investigation to you. The resolution under which your committee was organized refers to executive and administrative officers. While it is true the Senate is a legislative body, yet when men like Dr. Schimmel, whose salary is \$8,000, come from the administrative branch of government, it comes within the purview of your authority under the resolution when they are loaned to a Senate committee.

I also want to call to your attention that if the W. P. B. does not need Dr. Schimmel's services, then it becomes a question of "non-essential expenditures," as far as an executive officer is concerned. If the United States Senate requires the services of Dr. Schimmel, then he should be carried on the Senate pay roll at the regular salary of \$4,500 a year instead of on the W. P. B. pay roll at \$8,000 per year.

In any event, it is the taxpayer who finally pays the bill.

If the Senate needs expert and technical advice, the Senate should employ personnel for that service. They should represent the Senate of the United States, not a governmental agency nor any other outside interest. The Senate Members should know who they are; and only the clerks or the chief of staff of the Senate committees should be admitted to the privileges of the floor, as covered by the Senate rule.

I trust that your committee will act favorably upon this request for an investigation to the end that this whole matter of loaned experts to the United States Senate might be clarified.

I know that your committee has had a tremendous amount of work to do and while I am not a member of your committee, I would like to offer my services if I can be of any assistance in furthering this investigation.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH S. WHERRY.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in conclusion, let me state that I feel it to be in

the best interests of the United States Senate and of the Congress that such an investigation be made; and I trust that the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures will give my request their utmost consideration and that the membership of the committee will grant my request. I feel that such an investigation would not only be of great assistance to the Senate but also would render a great service to the people of the entire country.

PROMOTION OF LT. GEN. GEORGE SMITH PATTON, JR., TO BE MAJOR GENERAL IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, to report from the Committee on Military Affairs the following nominations:

Lt. Gen. George Smith Patton, Jr. (colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States, to be brigadier general in the Regular Army, with rank from September 1, 1943, vice Brig. Gen. Henry H. Arnold, appointed major general, Regular Army.

Lt. Gen. George Smith Patton, Jr. (colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States, to be major general in the Regular Army, with rank from September 2, 1943, vice Maj. Gen. Philip B. Peyton, retired.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask the able Senator from North Dakota to withhold his objection and allow me to report the nominations from the committee. If such consent is granted, I shall then make another request, and I wish the Senator would withhold his objection until I have done so.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the fact that the Senator reports certain nominations from the committee would not prevent another Senator from later objecting to the confirmation of the nominations.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is correct, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and the report will be received.

Mr. CHANDLER. I now ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered as an executive session.

Mr. LANGER. I object.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator please withhold his objection in order that the clerk may state the nominations?

Mr. LANGER. I withhold my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. George Smith Patton, Jr. (colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States, to be brigadier general in the Regular Army, with rank from September 1, 1943, vice Brig. Gen. Henry H. Arnold, appointed major general, Regular Army.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I do not believe anything could be said by the distinguished junior Senator from Ken-

tucky which would cause me to change my mind. I do not believe that now is the proper time to consider the nominations. Only a few Senators are on the floor. I do not think the nominations should be considered at this time. Eventually I, myself, may vote for confirmation of the nominations.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I ask that the Senator from North Dakota withhold his objection until I shall have had an opportunity to say a few words, and then if he wishes to press the objection I shall have no objection to his doing so.

Approximately 20 Senators are present. This morning the Senate Committee on Military Affairs unanimously voted to report to the Senate the nominations of Lieutenant General Patton to be promoted in rank.

General Eisenhower has announced that since the 3d day of August General Patton has been in charge of an army which has driven roughshod over the Germans in Normandy and Brittany. When the nominations were originally sent to the Senate I opposed them for the reason that General Eisenhower had reported to the Secretary of War that General Patton had slapped an American soldier. I felt that such harsh treatment of an American soldier was unjust, unwarranted, and, in the words used by General Eisenhower, indefensible and reprehensible. On the basis of that report I led the fight, if there was one, in the Military Affairs Committee against confirmation of the nominations. Since then circumstances have changed. I have never doubted the accuracy of the statements which have been made to me by soldiers all over the world to the effect that General Patton is a brave and courageous soldier. At this hour he is perhaps the greatest tank soldier in the world. His exploits in Tunisia and Sicily were magnificent. General Eisenhower weighed his services to his country and the intrepid leadership which he had displayed against what I have already referred to as his indefensible acts. He is now leading our American boys in the tanks to Paris, in what may prove to be an eventful victory of our arms. I have changed my mind, and I think on the basis of his record and what he has accomplished he is now entitled to be promoted. Other officers have been promoted to the rank of brigadier general or major general. These nominations have been pending since some time last year. I would not wish to say to an American officer who is facing the enemy and driving forward at the head of American soldiers, and who has demonstrated great leadership and ability, that he must not be promoted. However, if circumstances had not changed from what they were when the matter was originally presented to the committee, I would not vote to promote him.

Mr. President, the members of the committee did not vote to reconsider the action because no action had ever been taken. The members had merely declined to pass upon the nominations. I have recently consulted with the majority leader and the minority leader, and

they have no objection to the consideration of the nominations. If the Senator from North Dakota wishes to have consideration of the nominations postponed to a later date while General Patton is leading his forces in Europe, and debate the nomination at some future time, I am perfectly willing to engage in such debate, and it will occur at the next meeting of the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of the Senator's statement that members of the committee voted unanimously to report the nominations—

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator is correct. No objection has been made by any member of the committee.

Mr. LANGER. In view of the record which the Senator from Kentucky has presented to us, I gladly withdraw my objection. I had no personal feelings with regard to the situation.

Mr. CHANDLER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. I merely wish to explain that in view of the absence of a great many Senators it had occurred to me that we should postpone consideration of the matter until more Senators were present.

Mr. CHANDLER. I thank the able Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. President, I ask that the nominations be confirmed, and that the President be notified forthwith.

Mr. LANGER. Before that is done, I might say that my attitude was largely influenced by the very fact that the Senator led the fight.

Mr. CHANDLER. I did; but the circumstances have changed and, therefore, I have changed my position.

Mr. LANGER. I had much confidence in the Senator, and what he said at that time made a great impression upon my mind.

Mr. CHANDLER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, my request was that, as in executive session, the nominations be confirmed, and that the President be notified forthwith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent has been asked that action be taken immediately upon these nominations as in executive session. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the first nomination is confirmed.

The clerk will read the second nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lt. Gen. George Smith Patton, Jr. (colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States, to be major general in the Regular Army, with rank from September 2, 1943, vice Maj. Gen. Philip B. Peyton, retired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

EFFECT OF CORN PRICES AND REGULATIONS ON CATTLE PRODUCTION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a week before the Congress adjourned on June 23 last it will be recalled that 21 or 22 Senators—and I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr.

THOMAS] who now occupies the chair was one of the 21 or 22—signed a resolution addressed to Members of the Senate asking for an investigation into livestock feeding operations, more particularly cattle but including hogs and sheep, and also an investigation as to corn prices and the effect of such prices on feeding operations. The resolution was open to all Senators to sign, and I think there were names of 5 or 6 Democrats on it, including as I have said, the senior Senator from Oklahoma and the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and was reported from that committee. It was then referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, but was not reported from that committee during that week when the Senate was in session. It is still in the committee.

I should like to call the attention of the Members of the Senate today to the fact that the situation mentioned on the floor of the Senate away back in May or the first of June has now become a reality. Feeder cattle, utility cattle which are now being sent to the central market are being sold under the floor prices, and, as a result, the producers are not getting what the Department of Agriculture told them they would get for cattle which were shipped there.

The reason is that the subsidy which is paid to the producers, but which is a subsidy to the consumer instead of the producer, is paid monthly on the purchases made by the processors, who are the packers. They are paid on the average price for all classes of cattle. So, in order to get double A cattle to supply the armed forces and the higher priced markets of the country in which top prices are paid, less has to be paid for the utility cattle for which the Government is now making provision and to which it is giving publicity so as to promote sales over the counters, at the expense of every cattle producer in the United States of America.

From New Mexico comes complaint that the utility cattle are being sold beneath the floor price and the cattle growers who have produced and continue to produce are now taking the loss.

Unless the situation is corrected we will see embargoes placed on the cattle market, just as they were placed on the hogs, and there will be an over-surplus of utility cattle just as there was a surplus of eggs, when carloads of eggs that cost \$4.80 sold for as little as \$30. That is the situation which is facing the cattle producers today.

I have received a telegram on the subject from a feeder whom I know. He is not a politician; he is not a Government man; he is not a white-collared farmer; he is one of many cattle feeders who feed many head of cattle a year and sell them on the fat-cattle market. Here is the telegram:

KENNETH S. WHERRY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:
Corn prices and regulations now more than ever encourage black-market operations in corn. No prudent livestock feeder can plan

to feed where it is necessary to buy any material amount corn. With regulations as are now black-market operator can draw corn right from under everyone.

The corn order, it will be recalled, provided that industry could buy corn at 5 cents a bushel more than the corn feeder could pay for the same corn in the same locality, so that the only place the cattle feeder could buy corn was in the black market. That is exactly the situation it was sought to establish. It is an acute situation. Today, a feeder cannot feed corn to his cattle and pay a price comparable to what industry can pay for it, unless the cattle feeder buys corn on the black market. The effect is to make a crook out of every cattle feeder who has to buy corn.

The telegram continues:

With all the uncertainties that confront the livestock producer makes a serious situation and should have your attention. I am farmer-rancher, one of the big meat and wool producers; probably buy more corn for my own feeding than anyone.

The name of the sender of the telegram is Noel Cover, and he comes from the town of Cozad, Nebr. I can present to the Senate telegram after telegram and communication after communication of the same nature, but I do not want to clutter up the Record. I do at this time, however, ask unanimous consent that a report of the Live Stock Producers' Association, rendered on July 17, be printed in the body of the Record at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Giving credence to Washington rumors that the O. P. A. proposes to make drastic changes in its price programs affecting live stock prices, particularly beef cattle, the National Live Stock Producer in its current issue published today releases detailed information relating to a series of conferences since May 12 between the Joint Live Stock Committee, representing 130 livestock producer organizations and the Office of Price Administration, War Food Administration and Office of Economic Stabilization. Previous publicity has not been given to these conferences, it is stated, because of "an official request to consider such facts as confidential until a later date."

According to information received from Washington, the National Live Stock Producer says that the O. P. A. "with the disapproval of W. F. A., proposes to (1) take 50 cents off hog subsidies and add that amount to cattle subsidies; (2) beginning May 1, 1945 lower the minimum compliance price on the two upper grades of cattle by 50 cents and all other grades by \$1; (3) order that steers and heifers be separated from cows and bulls for packer subsidy compliance purposes, and (4) impart a maximum flat ceiling price of \$17 at Chicago on the slaughter cattle market."

Because of chaotic conditions existing in the live stock markets generally at that time, it is revealed that on May 12-13 the O. P. A. sent out telegraphed invitations to 11 important cattle producer and feeder representatives for a closed conference in Washington. To these cattle men the O. P. A. outlined certain "problems," that is—

"(1) due to narrow margins, packers generally were operating at a loss; (2) feed lot operations had been already drastically curtailed; and (3) early marketing operations should be encouraged to avoid a market glut of grass-fed cattle in the fall."

As solutions to these problems the O. P. A. proposed to increase subsidy payments and to reduce the price on lower beef grades to become effective in September and October of this year. The cattlemen present at the conference, however, responded that the problems were the result of ill-advised regulations and declared that the solutions were impractical.

At a subsequent meeting of the Joint Live Stock Committee held in Chicago on May 25, John J. Madigan, Chief of O. P. A. Price Section, reiterated the livestock industry problems and the O. P. A. solutions which were unanimously rejected by the producer group. They declared that price ceilings on livestock had been fixed at a time when conditions in the industry were abnormal, due particularly to abnormally cheap feed, and at a time when feeding profits were based largely on gains in weight. Since early of 1941 feed prices have more than doubled, the producers pointed out, and cattle feeding has shifted from a low-cost-of-gain basis to a price-margin basis with the result that it has been practically impossible to put better calves and yearlings into feed lots. "Approximately two-thirds of the producers of the better grades of beef lost money on their operations last year," it is stated.

A special committee appointed by the Joint Live Stock Committee working with beef cattle specialists from several Corn Belt agricultural colleges prepared a special report upon the increased feeding costs, packer slaughter margins, and allied problems. These facts were presented to the Office of Price Administration, War Food Administration, and Office of Economic Stabilization in a series of conferences held in Washington on June 8-9. "The producer's committee was impressed by O. P. A.'s general unwillingness to divulge their plans for correcting the chaotic condition in the beef cattle industry," said the National Live Stock Producer. "It was definitely stated, however, that there had been no attempt to lower prices on the lower cattle grades. O. P. A. seemed concerned primarily with obtaining more favorable ceiling margins for packers, indicating that this might be done by additional direct subsidies. The W. F. A., however, showed real interest in the producer's committee proposals and promised to carefully examine all future plans presented by O. P. A. Definite assurance was also given by the Director of Economic Stabilization that, before any decisions were made on O. P. A. proposals, producers would be given a further hearing."

That Government agencies are attempting to force a general liquidation of beef cattle and thus "cover up ill-advised control policies" that have been responsible for abnormal conditions in the industry, is charged by H. M. Conway, a livestock research authority, in an article appearing in the current issue of National Live Stock Producer, a farmer-owned trade publication.

"Our guardians in Washington seem to believe that all cattle represent so much beef," says Mr. Conway, "and that it is a matter of forcing numbers through slaughter channels without any sense of economic efficiency or of the welfare of the beef-cattle industry." With the supply of cattle from feed lots practically exhausted, this authority declares that "anything like adequate beef supplies would require a tremendous increase in slaughter numbers." It is stated, moreover, that meat supplies so far this year have been maintained largely by liquidation and premature slaughter of livestock.

Swine production has been cut to the point that the supply will be far short of the probable demand during the next 18 months, Mr. Conway asserts. He also indicates that the reason for the current limited demand for stocker and feeder cattle is that feed prices are relatively high and that there is not suffi-

cient spread in O. P. A. price limitations to justify finishing the better grades of beef.

As a solution to all the worries that have been encountered by producers of eggs and pork, the National Live Stock Producer, in its current issue published today, proposes editorially that the producers call a joint convention where they may arrange to go quietly nuts together. And, as they embark upon that route which leads to unworried bliss, they might send a message to range cattlemen: "We go to prepare a place for you."

Pointing out that eggs purchased by the War Food Administration at an average price of around \$4.800 a carload were offered to feed-mixing concerns at \$30, the editorial states that "this variety of economical result is known as planned economy." The normal procedure of permitting seasonally excess eggs to be sold to consumers at reduced prices was refused by Washington officials, it is stated, on the ground that this would conflict with the price-support program and lead to other complications. Eggs mixed into liquid tannage, however, the editorial continues, "makes an excellent poultry feed, with which to produce more eggs."

Cold storage facilities for the excess eggs was not generally available because at the cooler doors, eggs came into direct competition for space with a glut of fat back, sowbellies, and lard. Sizable quantities of lard were diverted to soap manufacture. Efforts of processors to find markets in the Caribbean and Mexico were thwarted by official regulations, it is stated, contributing to the fact that June prices for hogs reached the lowest point in 28 months. "Putting it mildly," the editorial declares, "this has not contributed to the happiness of swine producers."

Mr. WHERRY. The report sets out that what is needed is the elimination of governmental controls and the straightening out of the corn situation; also the establishment of margins so as to enable the feeders to feed cattle and get them to market, and, furthermore, the rescinding of the regulations so that there can be an orderly sale of utility cattle and not a glutted market, causing the producers to take a loss, as they have to do of sales under the floor, as such cattle are being sold today. This is unfair to the cattle producer. The Government has broken faith with the cattle producer, who is forced to sell utility cattle under the floor prices of today's markets.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. How many less cattle, by percentage, are being fed in Nebraska this year than last year?

Mr. WHERRY. In answer to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota I will say that I have a report which shows that in Nebraska there were 36 percent less cattle on feed in the month of June this year than in the month of June of the previous year. I know the percentage has increased in my locality. I live in a county-seat town, Pawnee City, Nebr., and from that place to the Kansas line there are located on farms 17 cattle feeders who buy and feed cattle. I know our firm, including my father and my uncle before me, has fed cattle for nearly 50 years. There is not one of those cattle feeders who has a head of cattle in the feed lot today.

Mr. LANGER. Is not that true all over the Northwest, so far as the Senator knows?

Mr. WHERRY. I think it is quite generally the case, because the reports from the State departments of agriculture show the same situation relative to the feeder cattle in other States.

Mr. President, I have asked that the resolution be reported by the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate so there may be an investigation, for no other reason than to be constructive and helpful to the War Food Administration, the Department of Agriculture, and the Office of Price Administration. The resolution was sponsored by Democrats and Republicans, from both sides of the aisle. The question is nonpartisan. The question is an economic one. Its correct solution means the life of the cattle feeders throughout the entire Corn Belt.

The chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control is not at this time on the floor of the Senate, but I ask the membership of the committee if they will not arrange for the proposed investigation by reporting the resolution with the appropriation asked, and I am quite sure that the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who has been suggested to act as chairman of the special committee, will accept, if he is offered the opportunity. Then we will have an impartial investigation, a nonpartisan one, where we may inquire into a situation which goes to the very economic life of our agriculture.

Mr. President, I hope something will be done. We are approaching a crisis in the cattle markets in this country and the Senator who is now presiding knows that if there should be dry weather in the Plains States, the utility cattle will come in by the thousands, and cause a glut of the market, and those who have raised cattle on the Plains will have to take a loss they should not be required to take and would not have to take if the recent order could be rescinded.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to substantiate what has been said by the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska. All over North Dakota men who for many years have been engaged in the business of taking poor cattle and feeding them have gone out of business. It is rarely one can find a man who was in that business and who is continuing in it. I join with the distinguished Senator in hoping that the proposed committee will be able to get to work promptly, and that the Committee to Audit and Control will make funds available with which to conduct a thorough investigation.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota for his remarks.

Mr. LANGER. I might add that in the hog situation the farmers all over the country were robbed by the packers. I offered a resolution some months ago to investigate that situation, and it was sent to the desk, but no action was ever taken on it. The fact is that the producer of hogs, the farmer, was robbed

of millions and millions of dollars, the money going to the packers, in spite of legislation in the nature of subsidies which Congress passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO REPORT BILLS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, yesterday the Committee on the Judiciary authorized the reporting of several bills. Some of the reports have been filed, others are in the process of preparation. I understand the Senate will presently recess until Friday. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that reports from the Committee on the Judiciary may be filed during the recess of the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. The request, as I understand, applies only to reports on bills which have already been authorized to be reported.

Mr. HATCH. Authorized yesterday, yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

Robert J. Watt, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the Federal Board for Vocational Education for a 3-year term ending July 17, 1947.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of Committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there are several postmaster nominations on the calendar. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that they be confirmed en bloc and that the President be notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the postmaster nominations are confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified immediately.

RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until Friday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, August 18, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 15, 1944:

COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Ugo Carusi, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, United States' Department of Justice, vice Earl G. Harrison, resigned.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineers with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

Howard S. Cole, from May 17, 1944.

John T. Guthrie, from May 17, 1944.

Robert W. McCarty, from May 21, 1944.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Sarah F. White, Arley, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Susie R. White, Baileytown, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John U. Walker, Bankston, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Robert B. Dennis, Beaverton, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Pearce Goggans, Bexar, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mabel J. King, Billingsley, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Andrew S. Weaver, Brookwood, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Irma C. Gabbett, Camp Hill, Ala., in place of Maunsell Gabbett, deceased.

Maude A. Bynum, Cleveland, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Flora Ballard, Detroit, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Benjamin F. Blanton, Fernbank, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lona W. Auxford, Flat Creek, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Annie K. Gilmer, Fulton, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Virginia C. Roberts, Gainesville, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John W. Collins, Jr., Gallion, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Auvia C. Byrd, Holly Pond, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Bernice R. Roberts, Joppa, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Nettie T. Waldrup, McCalla, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

George E. Culver, Mountain Creek, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Thomas B. Thompson, Piper, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lizzie H. Barton, Sipsey, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Walter W. Blackledge, Spruce Pine, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Janie Turner Wheeler, Steele, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Pearl Callahan, Steppville, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Beula V. White, Sterrett, Ala. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

ARIZONA

Rebecca W. Burgess, Eagar, Ariz. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Nellie I. Sherman, Hereford, Ariz. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John J. Newell, Naco, Ariz. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Don C. Tanner, Show Low, Ariz. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mina F. Fleischauer, Tuba City, Ariz. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

ARKANSAS

Leith S. Johnson, Banks, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Robert L. Burleson, Bearden, Ark., in place of T. B. Gatling, deceased.
 John B. Turner, Branch, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Ruth Lloyd, Damascus, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 John P. Hanni, Ellis, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Jennie Sharp Pylest, Etowah, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Stella K. Coffee, Gassville, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Fred M. Henry, McRae, Ark., in place of Bunyan Gilbert, retired.
 Clara Evans, Maysville, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Mary R. Lancaster, Mountain View, Ark., in place of B. S. Kent, resigned.
 Allie A. Irvin, Ozan, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 George F. Nixon, Ratcliff, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Pleas Fowler, St. Joe, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

CALIFORNIA

James A. Adrian, Jr., Banning, Calif., in place of J. E. White, deceased.
 William N. Wright, Bostonia, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Margaret E. Tann, Brisbane, Calif., in place of M. S. Dewhurst, resigned.
 Anna Olds Brown, Chualar, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Edith B. Clark, Clearlake Oaks, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Mabel Draper, Columbia, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Dorothy M. Krollpfeiffer, Del Monte, Calif., in place of R. M. Krollpfeiffer, resigned.
 Emma B. Near, Descanso, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Christine Haines, Earp, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Eunice C. Dick, Essex, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Rose Stringham, Fenner, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Gladys Head, Garden Grove, Calif., in place of W. S. Head, deceased.
 Alta E. Collins, Harbor City, Calif., in place of T. F. Gladwill, resigned.
 Juanita M. Casey, Kelso, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Guy E. Thrallkill, Leucadia, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Henry R. Gewe, Los Alamos, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Ramona P. Lansing, Los Olivos, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Archie L. Shelp, Marina, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Phoebe Vickroy, Montgomery Creek, Calif. Office became Presidential June 1, 1943.
 Geneva Christofferson, Potter Valley, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Mary E. Shear, Princeton, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Louis R. Riave, Santa Susana, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Selene M. Fair, Santa Ynez, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Amos R. Knupp, Scotia, Calif., in place of M. B. Pharr, retired.

COLORADO

Miles Crawford, Broomfield, Colo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

CONNECTICUT

Frank H. Schonrock, South Meriden, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Florence G. Joyce, Weatogue, Conn., in place of R. A. Parmelee, removed.

FLORIDA

Catharine C. Johnson, Arlington, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Alma Nall, Azucar, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Isaac W. West, Chosen, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Archibald C. Greiner, Dundee, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Percival L. Buzbee, Gibsonton, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Leah G. Green, Greensboro, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Irene E. Culbreth, Jennings, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Helen D. Hall, Lake Hamilton, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Robert G. Wood, Jr., Lithia, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Mary E. Walker, Lloyd, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Edward J. Courtoy, Nokomis, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 John E. Clonts, Oakland, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Wilbur A. Willis, Oklawaha, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Jane E. Henley, Orlovista, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Bert Emberton, Port Tampa, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Marvin A. Thomason, Produce, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Alice E. Robison, Wakulla, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Stephen R. Mallory, Wellborn, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Claude E. Crosby, Wesconnett, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

GEORGIA

Elizabeth M. Carlton, Bolton, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Ralston H. Kinsey, Mayfield, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

IDAHO

Zella G. Steele, Bancroft, Idaho, in place of George Alley, deceased.

ILLINOIS

James W. Arnold, Jr., Alto Pass, Ill., in place of Arthur McKinney, removed.
 Samuel J. Hicks, Bonnie, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Clarence V. Compton, Browns, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 John Hoelting, Carlinville, Ill., in place of D. E. Sexton, removed.
 Gertrude Tippy, Carterville, Ill., in place of R. M. Tippy, deceased.
 Marilla Clover, Cisco, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 John H. Leathers, Claremont, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Nellie Blohm, Coal Valley, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Raleigh Miller, Colp, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Oscar L. Dean, Cooksville, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Grace A. Morrison, Dalton City, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Eugene R. Ditzler, Davis, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Mabel E. Conroy, Emington, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Mary C. Schosser, Essex, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Isaac E. Hortenstine, Gays, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Edith Wieman, German Valley, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Marion W. Payne, Golf, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 June T. Snider, Gorham, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 William Jesse Ribble, Hettick, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Mary E. Donahue, Kenilworth, Ill., in place of Luella Kriete, deceased.
 Fannie L. Prater, Kilbourne, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Samuel V. Simpson, Mill Shoals, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Laura B. Hayes, Monroe Center, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Ada M. Tate, Mount Zion, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 William T. Steiner, Niota, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Wales S. Stamper, Olympia Fields, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Clyde Marlow, Opdyke, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Julius C. Gouy, Panama, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Frank C. Stofa, Riverside, Ill., in place of L. M. Lies, resigned.
 Francis W. Walters, Roberts, Ill., in place of D. E. Woolsoncroft, transferred.
 Victor M. Wallace, Roscoe, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Lena C. Kirts, Sainte Marie, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Henrietta Hinds, Secor, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Stella Bossong, Serena, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Fred E. Donaldson, Shobonier, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Carney V. Kerley, Simpson, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Bathews A. Jones, Sims, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Lona L. Manuel, Smithfield, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Jeff Mitchell, Ursa, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 John G. Finch, Verona, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Raymond E. Browning, Waggoner, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Sarah B. Gordon, West Point, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Dewey Coomes, Wolf Lake, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

INDIANA

Nina M. Stokesberry, Canby, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Hueston H. Harris, Denver, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.
 Elifa E. Leach, Lizton, Ind., in place of H. E. Bailey, deceased.

IOWA

William J. Hohnke, Atalissa, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Florence Fox, Fairfax, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Newton V. Benson, Geneva, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Lula M. Wilkins, Goodell, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Donald W. McShane, Luana, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Horace C. Campbell, Ollie, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Elsie C. Allen, Ogden, Iowa, in place of R. O. Bass, resigned.
 William Bryan Fenimore, Peru, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Lou Ella Jones, Rose Hill, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Clifford L. Larson, Scarville, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

KANSAS

Dora M. Phillips, Belpre, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 George E. Noble, Madison, Kans., in place of M. P. Davis, deceased.
 Eula Dorrell, Treece, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Roy T. Henderson, Winfield, Kans., in place of T. E. Van Meter, deceased.

KENTUCKY

Lillian F. Burke, Allen Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Darwin C. Wells, Auxier, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Clayton Samples, Bagdad, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Maywood Whitaker, Blackey, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Leonard H. Banks, Burdine, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Coy Oscar Glass, Dunham, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Owen L. Ellis, Dunnville, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Nellie Antis, Fullerton, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Mary B. Garvey, Glencoe, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Nelly B. Jones, Grand Rivers, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Edgar K. Sturgill, Harold, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Alvin Francisco, HELLER, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Frank May, Langley, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Dora E. Pike, Livingston, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Lawrence E. Ratliff, Lookout, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Bailey Kendrick, McAndrews, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Jimmie Lee Oldham, Okolona, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Ethel G. Abbott, Silver Grove, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Alice C. Cannon, Turners Station, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Louise R. McCormack, Waddy, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Irene T. Nickell, Webbville, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Fannie Runnels, West Prestonsburg, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Nellie Stafford, Wurtland, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

LOUISIANA

Oscar A. Johnson, Albany, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Ludwig A. Hebert, Bayou Goula, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Carmen Colomb, Chalmette, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Annie L. Couch, Chestnut, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Agnes B. Subra, Convent, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Vivian K. West, Evergreen, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Isabelle S. Booksh, Grosse Tete, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Ida E. Mounger, Lettsworth, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Betty M. Voigt, Provencal, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Libbie T. Tubre, St. Landry, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Maude M. Clark, Tioga, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Nita Rouillier, Union, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 James F. Willis, Sr., Varnado, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 William A. Rheams, Walker, La. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MAINE

Lee M. Rowe, Bryant Pond, Maine, in place of L. M. Rowe. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

MARYLAND

Norman J. Hutchison, Cordova, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Minnie L. Wilson, Eden, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Alice L. Eaton, Edgewater, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Richard G. Williams, Funkstown, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Joseph H. R. Talbott, Hanover, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Dorothy G. Hayden, Hollywood, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Travis D. Knode, Keedysville, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Nathan W. Childs, Millersville, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Herbert O. Trott, Owings, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 B. Gorman Swann, Piney Point, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Beulah E. Powell, Powellsville, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Mabel B. Disharoon, Quantico, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Marion L. Clark, Queen Anne, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Alma M. Yeatman, Ridge, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Genevieve H. Johnston, Timonium, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MASSACHUSETTS

Chester W. Robinson, Accord, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Kendall E. Andrews, Berlin, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Kate S. Taylor, Boylston Center, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Joseph A. Cantin, Clifford, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Ruth B. King, Colrain, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Linda F. Howard, Eastondale, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Nellie T. Huskin, Kennerma, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 George H. LaCroix, Leeds, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 George E. Plante, Manchaug, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Estelle E. Dionne, Ocean Grove, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Ruth P. Rossier, Paxton, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Evelyn I. Staples, Segreganset, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 John C. Jackson, Sherborn, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 David S. Caldwell, South Byfield, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Harold L. Laplante, South Vernon, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 John H. O'Toole, Sterling Junction, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Anna J. Rusek, Three Rivers, Mass., in place of S. F. Twiss, deceased.
 Rita G. Anderson, West Chelmsford, Mass. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MICHIGAN

William Herschel Miller, Hartford, Mich., in place of B. E. Shoemaker, deceased.
 Lyman E. Fay, Howell, Mich., in place of A. H. Pfau, transferred.
 John J. Hauserman, Negaunee, Mich., in place of Peter Trudell, Jr., retired.
 Ruth Hoffman, Palmyra, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Lorene D. Fosket, Pottsville, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 William F. Reddy, Twin Lake, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Anne M. Polich, West Olive, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MINNESOTA

Leonard W. Lamppa, Embarrass, Minn., in place of L. R. Lamppa, Jr., removed.

MISSISSIPPI

Sarah B. Hudson, Carpenter, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Louisa J. Megehee, Escatawpa, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Nannie R. Strickland, Eden, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Jerome C. Washington, Pheba, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Frank H. King, Pochontas, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Douglas R. Butler, Smithdale, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 William N. Mangum, Star, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

MISSOURI

Ola K. Pumphrey, Broseley, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Roy D. Holland, Butler, Mo., in place of R. D. Holland. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1938.
 Helen R. Land, Leasburg, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Oden W. Craighead, New Bloomfield, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Bernard Francis Dickmann, St. Louis, Mo., in place of W. R. Jackson, deceased.

MONTANA

Wilma Givogre, Wisdom, Mont., in place of R. E. Willey, resigned.

NEBRASKA

Rex Hicks, Amherst, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 William A. Horstman, Creighton, Nebr., in place of W. A. Horstman. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.
 Helen Betty Gott, Fort Robinson, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NEW JERSEY

Helen Moore, Lawnside, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Edward T. Sherwood, Rosemont, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

NEW YORK

John A. Briars, Cold Water, N. Y., in place of C. A. Field, resigned.
 Sidney G. Potter, Eaton, N. Y., in place of D. W. Rogers, resigned.
 Paul J. Perrault, Johnson City, N. Y., in place of R. F. McCabe, removed.
 John M. Paul, White Plains, N. Y., in place of P. A. Murphy, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Margaret Vinson, Autryville, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Eugenia W. Walters, Blanch, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Thomas O. Minton, Champion, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Elsie B. Godley, Chocowinity, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Lucy Kelly, Coats, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Lucile McI. Hemingway, Godwin, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Benjamin F. Gough, Hamptonville, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Allan C. Haley, Hanes, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Walter J. Wynne, Havelock, N. C. Office became Presidential January 1, 1944.
 Hettie M. Baum, Kitty Hawk, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Jacob C. Nye, Orrum, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Paul V. Fitzgerald, Pelham, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Fannie B. Duval, Pollocksville, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Thomas A. Gentry, State Road, N. C. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

OHIO

Frank A. Driscoll, Bedford, Ohio, in place of F. L. Carr, removed.
 Earl N. Tarrier, Bidwell, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Lud E. Treece, Continental, Ohio, in place of John Whitman, transferred.
 Charles H. Barth, Fresno, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.
 Roma V. Condrey, Germantown, Ohio, in place of Walter Miller, resigned.
 Arthur Fisher, Hiram, Ohio, in place of G. C. Wilson, resigned.

John R. Gallagher, Ludlow Falls, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Ruth L. Bergamy, Somerville, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

OKLAHOMA

Woodrow Wilson Moody, Calera, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Ira Earl McCann, Calumet, Okla., in place of T. J. Hurst, transferred.
 Edna M. Smith, Deer Creek, Okla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Millard B. Means, Dewey, Okla., in place of P. M. Myers. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.
 Robert A. Shepherd, Tecumseh, Okla., in place of L. W. Karr, removed.

OREGON

Charles P. Hunter, Colton, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Lynn A. Wheeler, Mapleton, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Lenora Hunter, Mosier, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Stella A. Howard, Mulino, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Valera McDonald, Shedd, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Chester F. See, Warm Springs, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

PENNSYLVANIA

William D. Anderson, Linden, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Franc G. Neuland, Lucinda, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Manning J. O'Connor, Mineral Point, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Lawrence L. Hackman, Oberlin, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Daisy O. Deardorff, Orrtanna, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Ethel T. Croft, Osceola, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
 Mary L. Kovalchick, Sagamore, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

RHODE ISLAND

Arthur J. Stokes, Forestdale, R. I. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Charlie H. Arnold, Greene, R. I. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Esther Opsahl, Carpenter, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Marjorie F. Sougstad, Fulton, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 William O. Brennan, Sherman, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Jesse V. Heath, Vivian, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Anna F. Dillon, Whitewood, S. Dak. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

TENNESSEE

Allie Jane Jones, Bartlett, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 John F. Hall, Birchwood, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Tressa Connell, Eads, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Lizzie Roney, Fountain Head, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Ethelyne M. Peacher, Indian Mound, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Mabel B. Reasoner, Joelton, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Guy R. Huffaker, Kodak, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Jessie P. Bledsoe, Minor Hill, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Sarah E. Dickey, Mulberry, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Ashton B. Wood, Normandy, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Berbin Ellis, Robbins, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Evelyn B. Young, Shell Creek, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Martha Thomas Sykes, Stewart, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Virgil Banks, Summitville, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John T. Malone, Taft, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Robert C. Mobley, Tennessee Ridge, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mary Lou Cannon, Thompsons Station, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Nelson B. Rucker, Washburn, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Loulie Turner, Westpoint, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

TEXAS

Lucy F. Reynolds, Aledo, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John W. Boyett, Appleby, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Herman A. Krause, Beasley, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Felix A. Krause, Burlington, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mary B. Rankin, Bynum, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Zella E. Mitchell, Campbell, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Otis J. Bronstad, Cranfills Gap, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William M. Riddle, Dale, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Eugene B. Griffing, Danbury, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Robert H. Mills, Dodd City, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Huel D. Ray, Ector, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Guyler Hamblen, Fostoria, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Vivian E. Cobb, James, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Charles W. Rankin, Jr., Jonesboro, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ralph L. Johnson, Laneville, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ada H. Worley, Malone, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Myrta E. Nichols, Melissa, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Charles K. Langford, Mertens, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Cyrus M. Walsworth, O'Brien, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Neeta Shaw, Ovalo, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Virgil R. Laycock, Ravenna, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Rasselas C. Boyd, Rochelle, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Bertha M. Johnson, Salado, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Claude C. Strickland, Savoy, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Alma Leta Clements, Sebastian, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William E. McIntosh, Utopia, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Peregrina Benavides, Zapata, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Malvin L. Cobb, Zephyr, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

VERMONT

Leo B. Dunn, Brandon, Vt., in place of M. C. Mulcahy, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Samuel T. Ish, Aldie, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ethel C. Cooksey, Amissville, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Elizabeth E. Epperson, Ararat, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William C. Crowe, Atkins, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William H. Sproles, Benhams, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Mae Z. Reynolds, Blue Ridge, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Rena R. Carter, Burke, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Grayson M. Sandy, Callao, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Allie J. Renick, Callaway, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Francis S. Shockey, Copper Hill, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Frank E. Pope, Drewryville, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Irvin T. Arthur, Driver, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

James J. Orr, Dryden, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Charles H. Jones, Dry Fork, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Elizabeth P. Tompkins, Duffield, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Vivian H. Hale, Elk Creek, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Sidney B. Henson, Elliston, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Alvis T. Davidson, Faber, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Elma R. Flippo, Fairfield, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Adelia L. Humphries, Fentress, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Charles E. Black, Fordwick, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Edgar B. Shumate, Glen Lyn, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

James S. McCauley, Goodes, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Lloyd B. Williams, Hayes Store, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Thomas R. Looney, Keen Mountain, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Verda E. Thompson, Keokee, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Dorothy D. Turner, Lyndhurst, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ada C. Hilbish, Piney River, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Mercer E. Thomas, Pounding Mill, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

George J. Akers, Riner, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ruben L. Ford, Roda, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Oswald M. Hall, St. Charles, Va., in place of W. F. Boone, removed.

Mary V. Owen, Sedley, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Alice T. Coleman, Spotsylvania, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Janie A. Boyd, Stonegap, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ellis M. Calhoun, Sugar Grove, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

John A. Vernon, Sutherland, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Frances I. Brown, Swoope, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Annie E. Gallimore, Sylvatus, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Julia E. West, Tasley, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

M. Frances McManaway, Thaxton, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Ruby T. W. Parr, Tye River, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Sidney D. Mangus, Vesuvius, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Roland S. Sheppard, Walkerton, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Jennings J. James, Waterford, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Imogen E. Daniel, Weems, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

William C. Carter, Whitetop, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Alvaro de Lugo, Charlotte Amalie, V. I., in place of Alvaro de Lugo. Incumbent's commission expired June 13, 1942.

WASHINGTON

George W. Adams, Leham, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Ernest E. Cain, Malden, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Margaret Ellen Randall, Manchester, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WEST VIRGINIA

John E. Greene, Adrian, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Russell M. Yeager, Carbon, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Albert E. Adams, Cassville, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Louise Brown, Chelyan, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Pearl Varney, Crum, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Claude Handley, Culloden, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Donald C. Shonk, Dawes, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 John O. P. Johnson, Dellslow, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Charlotte Mitchell, Diamond, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Elizabeth M. Tabor, East Lynn, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Maggie DeMary, Enterprise, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Paul E. Thomas, French Creek, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Arch C. Moore, Glasgow, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Everett B. Wray, Glen White, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Guy R. Avey, Great Cacapon, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 William H. Ryan, Hendricks, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Ray E. Craddock, Henlawson, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Van B. Stith, Highcoal, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Frank O. Trump, Kearneysville, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Buster G. Bowling, Lester, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Grace V. Crow, Letart, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Louise W. Davis, Lookout, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Lacy P. Wallace, McAlpin, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Virgil L. Mathias, Mathias, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Estrue K. Harrah, Meadow Bridge, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Gusta Gall, Moatsville, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Veda M. Dunham, Proctor, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Lora E. Ambler, Red House, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Amer W. Loughry, St. George, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Orion G. Callison, Slab Fork, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Robert E. Wilson, Stanaford, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Sada S. Goode, Stirrat, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Emmett W. Williams, Statesbury, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Edmund C. Berkeley, Van, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Edith Mead, Wilsonburg, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 James N. Flanigan, Wolf Summit, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

WISCONSIN

Abraham A. Siegel, Hawthorne, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
 Gregor John Bock, Highland, Wis., in place of A. J. McGuire, transferred.
 Henry Magnuson, Irma, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 15, 1944:

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

George Smith Patton, Jr., to be brigadier general, to rank from September 1, 1943.
 George Smith Patton, Jr., to be major general, to rank from September 2, 1943.

POSTMASTERS

FLORIDA

Frank A. Clement, Boca Raton.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Irving Rolston, Greenland.

OKLAHOMA

Florence A. Davis, Goltry.

TEXAS

Hazel M. Ricks, De Kalb.

UTAH

Affalone Jensen, Centerfield.
 William Grogan, Price.
 Martha E. Alverson, Stockton.

WASHINGTON

Velma P. Hix, Duwall.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, AUGUST 15, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
 Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of majesty and mercy, from whom to turn away is to fail, but in whom to trust and abide is victory, we pray that all the barriers that separate us from Thee may be broken down and submerged by a renewed consecration to Thy holy will.

Reverently we would now wait upon Thee, drawn not only by our finite needs but impelled by that infinite assurance that Thy strength is made perfect in weakness and by those glorious promises that they who wait upon the Lord shall mount up with wings as eagles, they shall run and not be weary, they shall walk and not faint.

We pray that the spirit of knowledge and understanding, of insight and inspiration, of fidelity and fortitude, may be given unto the Members of Congress, upon whom there rests the responsibility of leadership in finding ways whereby the kingdom of blessedness shall be brought in an abundant measure to suffering and struggling humanity.

Hear us in the name of Christ who went about doing good and who gave His life for the redemption of the world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. LEWIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in

the RECORD in two instances; in one, to include an editorial appearing in the Lawrence (Mass.) Evening Tribune, dated July 22, 1944, entitled "Strongest Front," and, in the other, an editorial appearing in the Boston (Mass.) Post, dated August 8, 1944, entitled "Post-war Lend-Lease."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE RECENT POWHATAN MINE DISASTER

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

[Mr. LEWIS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

NATURAL GAS VERSUS ANTHRACITE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WALTER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 620, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 620), as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5125, to provide for the disposal of surplus Government property and plants, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 days to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes. I shall later yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] the usual 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of a very, very important bill, H. R. 5125, that has been thoroughly considered and on which hearings have been held by many committees of the House, including special committees, and also committees of the Senate, looking to an orderly and prudent disposition of Government property. It includes the combined wisdom and judgment of many Members of the House and embodies many of the provisions of the various bills that have been introduced by many of the Members on both sides of the aisle.

I wish to congratulate the committee that reported this bill, because, before it reported the bill, the committee members used excellent judgment in obtaining advice from outstanding men of the various Government departments and agencies, and many leaders in private life who are vitally concerned, all of whom enlightened members of the committee on expenditures in the executive departments preliminary to the preparation of this important piece of proposed legislation that will have to do with the disposition of billions and billions of dollars worth of Government property at the termination of the impending war and even before that.

Mr. MANASCO, the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GIFFORD, Mr. CHURCH, and Mr. PATMAN, appeared before the Committee on Rules, and, after the committee had heard all these gentlemen favor this proposed rule, it unanimously reported this rule, which provides for general debate of not to exceed 2 days on the bill. After the general debate, the bill will be considered under the 5-minute rule. This is not a closed or a gag rule which some people thought we should bring to the floor of the House. The Committee on Rules and the legislating committee which reported the bill felt that any Member of the House who might wish to do so should have the opportunity to offer an amendment.

I understand that some amendments will be offered; but, having read the bill carefully and heard the testimony, I feel that this is about as strong and as nearly perfect a bill as the House can pass. Of course, there is nothing perfect, but I think this is a splendid bill, splendidly written.

Again I say that the committee did not feel that it should rely solely on the various departments which submitted their recommendations and ideas as to what the bill should contain. The members of the legislative committee themselves have seen fit to revise and rewrite and amend the bill so that today I think it is about as good a bill, and as carefully written, as I have stated before, as it has ever been my pleasure to report a rule on.

There are some provisions in the bill in which I have been interested for many years, due to the experience and knowledge I gained during the last war. They relate to the disposition of surplus Government property abroad. I feel that any machinery or tools or anything else that we may possess abroad after this

war should not be sold for a song or given away to any country, regardless of how friendly it might be, to enable it to compete with us and so deprive American labor of employment. I know many gentlemen are now seeking to obtain a great deal of the up-to-date machinery that has been designed during the last few years, and that some of the foreign countries would like to secure this machinery so as to be able to compete with us in production and so take business and work away from our country.

The House will be fortunate to hear an explanation of the bill from the chairman of the Post-war Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], who originally introduced the bill, after his committee had held many hearings on it. He feels that the committee now reporting the bill has acted wisely in adopting certain protective amendments.

There is only one contest or objection that I feel may arise as to the bill. It provides for one surplus property administrator. Some gentlemen feel that there should be a surplus-property disposal board. I, myself feel that the responsibility of administrative authority should not be divided, but should be vested in one man so that he may be held accountable by the Congress, by the President, and by the country. We have a man who is now acting in that capacity by Executive order of the President, Mr. W. L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, who, I am informed, is very capable and desirous of serving the country. Although the bill provides a compensation of \$12,000 annually for a surplus property administrator, I understand that remuneration does not interest him, as he is supposed to be a very wealthy gentleman. The chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and the membership of the House Small Business Committee feel that a board should be created for the purpose of disposing of these tremendous surpluses of materials, merchandise, plants, and machinery running into the billions of dollars. I have the utmost confidence in the sincerity and judgment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] but I feel in this instance there should be no division of authority. It should be vested in one head who should and will be held accountable and responsible for the efficient administration of the disposition of these tremendous surpluses and the safeguarding of the Government's interest in every respect.

Mr. Speaker, I recollect regretfully the mishandling of our surplus property after the last war, both here and abroad, when some irresponsible gentlemen having authority to dispose of the surpluses played into the hands of their own former employers, which brought about prosecutions in 1921 and 1922 of some but not all of them. This situation I hope will not happen again because, as one who insisted on the prosecution of the guilty manipulators after the first war, I pledge myself to do likewise if I should obtain any information as to any malfeasance or unfair dealings on the part of those who will be entrusted with the disposi-

tion of these billions of Government surplus property. I feel that the pending bill provides all proper safeguards and it is my earnest hope that the man that the President will appoint will measure up to the fullest degree in honestly and efficiently carrying out this job to the best interest of the Government. Some persons believe that the present surplus property administrator will be designated to act under the provisions of this measure. I do not know but I do hope he will be a man who has no connections with any special business or financial interests or with the group who are now maneuvering to acquire some of the large plants, stock piles of raw materials, and merchandise.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to take up with the President about a year ago the need for legislation to provide for the proper disposition of our surplus property. I especially called attention to the need of safeguards which would not permit cartels or any foreign nation to acquire our latest designed machinery and tools, and even raw materials, that were in use in foreign countries which, if acquired, would operate to our disadvantage in that with this latest equipment they would more easily compete with us. I called attention to what one of the friendly nations was then doing and is even now undertaking to control foreign trade after the war. I know what is being done in Mexico and South America, and its activities are surely not conducive to our best interests. At the time of my talk with the President I think Mr. Clayton had already been appointed under the Executive order, and it is my recollection that he thought he had appointed a good man to devise plans and to formulate a policy for the efficient disposal of our surplus property. Shortly after this I submitted my views to Mr. Clayton as well as to others named by him and admonished them as to the care that must be taken in the disposition of these vast surpluses so that there might not be a repetition of the conditions experienced after the first war. I recall a conference I had with a gentleman, Mr. Olrich, who impressed me greatly as a sound, capable, and experienced businessman, who acquainted me with the preliminary plans for the disposition of the surplus property under the jurisdiction of the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department. It is men of his type needed in the administration of the disposition of these vast surpluses and it is to be hoped that more men of his business caliber will be found in the organization provided for under this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I have foreseen the need of this legislation for over a year, but after all, as others have stated, the proper and successful disposition of the surplus property will depend largely on how the law will be administered. I know that it is the President's earnest desire that these surpluses be disposed of in such manner as to do the least harm to our economic structure and at the same time to bring the largest available return to the Government in order to lessen the burden of taxation as much

as possible. I regret I cannot recall the words of the President, but in substance he emphasized his sincere desire to obtain the services of the most efficient, capable, and sincere men to constitute the organization force to bring about the early and proper disposition of the surpluses and at the same time to give the small businessmen, the small merchants, the farmers, and the exservice-men full opportunity to acquire a just share of the lands and surplus property that will be available.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time and yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule, and I do not think there will be very much opposition to it. It brings before the House one of the series of bills that have to do with post-war economic planning and adjustment. The House has been criticized, I believe, very unjustly, in the press and over the radio by commentators and held responsible for the delay in the consideration of this bill. Now, let us look at the record, as Al Smith used to say, and see what the record discloses. The Congress put through, and it was enacted into law on July 1, the so-called termination of contracts bill, which provided for the termination of the war contracts. That was the first of the series of this type of legislation emanating largely from the Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning. Most of it originated from the recommendations of Mr. Bernard M. Baruch and Mr. John Hancock. This is the second of the series and seeks to dispose of surplus war materials. I want to insist for the record that the Congress is not to blame in any way, neither the Republican nor Democratic Members, for the delay in the consideration of this legislation. Last June, or early in July, just before the House took a recess, there was a joint hearing in the Senate Office Building of the House and Senate Post-war Policy Committees, and William L. Clayton, the Administrator of Surplus War Properties, appointed under Executive order, testified before this joint committee. So far as I know, Mr. Clayton is an experienced and able administrator and is doing a good job. But, knowing in advance that the Congress would be attacked for the delay, I took occasion then to ask him why he had withheld for 3 months from making any recommendations for legislation to dispose of surplus war property and told him at the time that the Congress would be held responsible and not the executive branch of the Government and not Mr. William L. Clayton. He admitted the facts: that he was responsible for the delay; that the legislation was difficult, and that it took a long time to consider its ramifications to formulate a workable and constructive bill. He took the full responsibility, which was a fair thing to do, for delaying the consideration of this important legislation until 24 hours before the Congress took a recess. In the meantime the committees in both the House and the Senate have proceeded

and considered the legislation, and I want to give all possible credit to the gentleman who is sponsoring the legislation, my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], chairman of the Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning, who remained in Washington during the heat of the recess with a subcommittee, and has worked out this bill and brought before the House a constructive piece of legislation to solve a very difficult and pressing problem. The House is here, ready to proceed, without any unnecessary delay, in enacting this legislation. It should be enacted into law before the 1st of September. I think we have done our full duty, and I commend the committees of the House for expediting the legislation.

There are one or two angles of the bill that I would like to discuss under the rule, which were not emphasized in the original bill. I think Members of the House who represent industrial districts will probably be interested in the proper solution of the following problem. We have sent vast quantities of goods of all kinds abroad. After the last war enterprising manipulators and businessmen bought goods and property which we had sent abroad at 5 and 10 cents on the dollar, and then brought it back here and placed it upon the American market, dislocating the home market and creating more unemployment. I believe amendments will be offered if our home market is not adequately taken care of in this bill; they are certain to be made on the floor of the House and I believe adopted, to prevent the redumping and resale of American goods that are already overseas in vast quantities which would come back here after having been bought at 10 cents on the dollar, to ruin the American market and create enormous unemployment. I am not sure whether it is properly safeguarded in the bill which was reported by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. If that provision is not in it, then I hope that there will be a definite fight upon the floor of the House to prevent the redumping and resale of those goods upon the American market, because if they are, then the same thing will happen which happened after the last war where certain industries were put out of business and unemployment became rampant. There is a fight being waged on this bill on the ground that too much power is centralized in the director. I have a good deal of sympathy with those who would wish otherwise. The committee which considered this legislation had that under advisement from the beginning. We have no desire to set up a one-man dictatorship to dispose of the surplus war property, but after all, in dealing with a proposition of such magnitude, you have got to place power in the hands of one man. Therefore, as the result of the necessity and of the needs of the occasion, the director has been given vast powers. I do not know how you can limit those powers. If he is a good man he will do a good job. If he is a bad man he should not be there.

If he is incompetent he should not be there. He must report to the Congress every 3 months. He must come back for additional legislation. If he is not cooperating with the Congress and if he is not doing a good job, then the Congress can turn down his further demands for legislation or the Congress can write any legislation it desires in order to remedy the situation.

I must confess I do not know of any way of setting up an agency of this kind without giving the director vast powers to dispose of our surplus war material. We have to assume that the director will be honest, that he will be efficient, and that he will be a sound businessman and an able administrator. We do not know who will be appointed, but certainly Mr. Clayton has had business experience and has been a success in business and has handled the position he now holds ably and well. If he is appointed, he should make a capable administrator. It depends very largely on who is appointed. So far as I am concerned, I am going along with the committee to give proper and adequate power to the administrator and not dissipate it in lots of boards all over the country and get only limited results in disposing of our surplus war material rapidly, honestly, and efficiently.

Mr. Speaker, after this bill is through—and I believe it will be passed and enacted into law within 10 days—the Committee on Post-war Economic Planning and Policy proposes to recommend another bill almost immediately to set up a definite agency for mobilization of war and conversion.

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

After the pending bill is disposed of and immediately following it, there will be another bill—a noncontroversial bill—to set up a definite agency by law instead of by Executive order, known as the war mobilization and conversion agency. I think that bill will be passed without any opposition, because it simply does by law what is now being done by Executive order. Both sides of the House are rather fed up with Executive orders and we prefer to legislate here in the House and set up our own agencies by law.

That leaves, as a part of the entire program for post-war economic policy and planning, just one problem. That is the controversial problem of unemployment insurance. I assume the Committee on Ways and Means will hold hearings, thorough and detailed hearings, to work out a proper and adequate program to submit to the House. When that is done, then the entire post-war program will be completed, no matter when the war is ended. Then the legislation will already have been enacted and will be effective immediately upon the termination of the war. To that extent I want to take occasion to express praise of the different committees of the House which have been working during the heat of the summer in getting this legislation in order. All we have to do in the next few days is to talk in general debate and act on the bill probably by Thursday

night. It is an important bill but not very controversial. However, there is one item that should be discussed even in this bill, and that is unemployment insurance. That is not contained in the bill. It seems to me we are facing this whole issue with a very defeatist attitude if we assume that after the war is over we will have twenty or thirty million unemployed and that everybody will have to have unemployment insurance in order to subsist.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Now, what is the purpose of all this legislation? It only has one purpose and that is to preserve our American system of free enterprise; to try to expand it in order to meet after-war needs, to employ over 20,000,000 people; 11,000,000 who will be mustered out from our armed forces and 11,000,000 more who will be demobilized from the war factories. This series of post-war bills have one objective, namely, to take care of the unemployment situation after the war and to save free American enterprise. We are trying to do it now by legislation in advance, to get business and the Government working together so that when the soldiers return we can convert from wartime to peacetime industry and proceed immediately to employ American labor. If this is not successful, if we fail here in Congress, and if industry and the Government fail then we face chaos in America with 20,000,000 unemployed. Then every radical, every Communist, every Socialist, every "pink," and "left-winger" will denounce American free enterprise and say that it has failed, and that we must scrap our American system and take up something else along communistic or socialistic lines or Government ownership.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to ask the gentleman in line with what he has just stated himself about the importance of avoiding a period of unemployment depression, whether he does not think that will be avoided much better if the Congress, in a thoroughgoing, realistic fashion, faces the problem of preventing any serious decline in the market demand and consumer purchasing power of the country; and whether the gentleman does not think that the provision for adequate unemployment compensation is a part of that job to meet the reconversion program.

Mr. FISH. I just said that the Committee on Ways and Means should consider that whole problem separately and immediately, in a most careful manner; but not with the defeatist point of view that it is necessary to put every American on unemployment insurance after the war; because that is not the purpose of this legislation.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Certainly not, but the more promptly you are prepared to prevent any spiral getting started the more certain you will be that none will start.

Mr. FISH. I understand the Ways and Means Committee will meet immediately to consider that problem.

In conclusion I again insist that the Congress has not delayed in considering this legislation, in spite of what the people back home have read in the press and heard on the radio. We have done our full duty and expeditiously. If there is any responsibility for delay it rests with Mr. William L. Clayton, of the executive branch of the Government. However, no harm has been done. This legislation will be enacted into law before the war has terminated. We hope it will end in a short time, but we will get this bill to dispose of surplus war material passed in a few weeks which will be ahead of a victorious conclusion of the war in Europe, and to that extent we have done our full duty and we are prepared to try to uphold and preserve free American enterprise and to employ our returning servicemen and those other millions of American wage earners who will be demobilized from our war factories.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, any measure that brings about a meeting of minds on the part of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] must be bombproof. I want to commend that which was said by both gentlemen to your careful consideration.

I remarked on yesterday in the Committee on Rules that I had seen evidence of more careful and straight thinking on the part of Congress in the last 10 days than I had expected. We found that in the Senate in what was done with respect to the George bill last week, and in this body in what thus far has been done with respect to the bill that is to be brought before you.

The Committee on Rules was tremendously impressed with the fine candor displayed by the gentlemen who appeared before that committee on yesterday advocating the granting of this rule. They made an extraordinarily fine showing, and I think completely broke down all resistance within that committee to the Colmer bill.

Of course, there are those of us who could find objections; but as to whether they are sufficiently valid as to justify amendments I am extremely doubtful. I am prepared to accept the bill as it has been reported. While I could favor the adoption of perhaps one or two amendments, I am constrained to believe that the House would make a mistake if it were to embark upon the taking of this bill apart and endeavoring to reconstruct it here on the floor.

I do not think any agency of this House has ever functioned more realistically, more sensibly, and I believe more

satisfactorily than the committee which worked out this bill, under the chairmanship of our friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER]. The legislative committee, reporting the bill considered it very carefully. The chairman of that committee the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO], with members of the committee, appeared yesterday and disclosed that the Colmer bill was changed only in minor particulars. The bill as reported by the Colmer committee is substantially the bill that you have before you.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] made a correct observation when he said that the proposal was sound, and as to whether it worked satisfactorily would depend upon the administration. I think the general belief is, and I certainly think we all hope that Mr. Clayton will be named administrator. Thus far, under the executive order, he has done a splendid job. I have heard of no complaint except some delay in acting after his first appointment, which is easily explainable. It was a big job that had to be surveyed, examined, and studied in order to be treated intelligently, and it took some time for Mr. Clayton to get his bearings and accumulate information.

I am sure there is one thing that strikes the membership of this body as being most extraordinary, and that is the seeming unanimity of thought on this proposal. Thus far there has not been a single expression indicating any purpose on the part of anybody to make politics out of it. In its importance it transcends all politics and is being treated by this House as such. I hope the House may find it possible to accept the bill in its entirety as it has been proposed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, there is but one issue before the House at the moment, and that is, Does the House desire to take up for immediate consideration this bill which has been so adequately explained by those preceding me? It does not make any difference if there has been delay; and I say there has not been delay; the question now is, Shall we proceed to prepare for the day which we know is rapidly approaching? The bill before us deals with one segment of the problem with which we shall be confronted when that day arrives.

There is no occasion for debate on this rule, because I take it that every single informed person throughout the length and breadth of the land favors action now by the Congress on this particular subject matter. If this be true, then it is up to us to proceed. Your Rules Committee has granted in every detail the rule asked for by the committee reporting the bill. Under this rule the bill as prepared by the committee will be read. The reading of the bill will be preceded by 2 days of general discussion. All those who want to express their points of view on the bill—and the debate is confined to the bill; it is not to be a field day for speech making—will have the opportu-

nity. When the bill is read it will be read section by section, and every individual Member of the House will be given his right to offer such amendments as he may see fit, which are germane to the bill and which in any way will, in his opinion, perfect the bill. So far as I am concerned, with the superficial study I have been able to give to the bill, I am ready to vote for it as it is. I reserve the right, however, if and when amendments are offered by any Member, to support those amendments if I conscientiously believe they will better accomplish the purpose for which the bill has been presented.

I believe we ought to get to the business of the day as soon as possible, pass this rule without further discussion, and enter upon the task that is before us. The members of the legislative and special committees are fully advised and will explain in every detail every provision of the bill. If this bill can be improved, the House will have an opportunity to do that. If you have suggestions, here is the place to present them.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] the chairman of the committee.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, it is of course obviously impossible for anyone to undertake to explain a bill of this magnitude and of the complexities involved in the short space of 10 minutes, but with your permission and your patience I should like to discuss some of the high points of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, as already has been said, this subject of surplus property disposal has received careful, long, and thorough study by the Congress. When this Committee on Post-war Economic Policy and Planning was set up, one of the first things it did was to have before it the distinguished gentleman who now heads the Office of Property Disposal, Mr. W. L. Clayton, and we went into that matter thoroughly with him at that time. As my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has already commented, Mr. Clayton, by implication at least, asked that time be given to study this matter, believing that, in the light of the experience he would gain in disposing of the then surplus property, we no doubt would be in a more advantageous position to legislate intelligently upon this subject. Many hearings were had. Extensive hearings were had by the Committee on Public Lands, of which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] is chairman, and of which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO] is a member. As has already been said, joint hearings were had between the two post-war committees of the Senate and the House; then a subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], a member of the House Post-war Committee, went into hearings on the matter. Then the Post-war Committee of the House and the Committee on Expenditures which had reported this bill held joint sessions last week, and again the matter was thoroughly considered. As a result of all these hearings you now have before you H. R. 5125, a bill that is not perfect, but one that

seeks to obtain certain objectives. I believe these objectives can be stated broadly in two subheads: First, the objective of protecting the American taxpayer; and, second, the objective of disposing of this surplus property with as little interference with our American economy as possible. These are the broad objectives of the bill. The divisions might be subdivided into many parts, and in order that you may see their ramifications I refer you to page 7 of the report submitted by the Post-war Economic Policy and Planning Committee, but which I shall not take your time to read here or go into.

In the preparation of this bill we wanted to attain those two objectives. We also wanted to see that the small taxpayer, the small merchant, and the man of small means had an equal opportunity with the man of more means to acquire this property.

We also wanted to see that the returning veteran would be given an opportunity to acquire this property. We also wanted to provide that the property shall be disposed of through the regular commercial channels insofar as possible so as not to dislocate the domestic market. These and many other things we had in mind in the preparation of this bill.

But bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely impossible to spell out in this legislation any particular thing that may be desired to obtain. Whenever one does that, without bearing in mind the other things involved, he runs headlong into another objective which he had. The result is that if we are not very careful we will defeat the very purposes which we set out to obtain in the beginning.

Let me say further that this is possibly the largest merchandising job that has ever been undertaken, as someone has previously said. The Administrator of this set-up, under the pending legislation, will be called upon to dispose of more merchandise than any merchant ever had in the history of this country. Let us just see how we are going to do that, if that situation is true. Let us assume that you had acquired the greatest supply of merchandise ever put together in the history of the world. Would you undertake to write certain proscribed formulas from which there could be no variation? For instance, the price of 10,000,000 or more articles that would be disposed of, from which there would be no leeway and no discretion? Of course, you would not, because that would be foolish. To bring it back to a more apt illustration, Should this Congress take over Sears, Roebuck and say that their property should be disposed of in such and such a manner and at such and such a price? You realize that could not be done because before the ink had dried on the regulations and the formula prescribed the prices would change, a new condition would arise, and there would be practically an impossible situation.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. As I understand it, the gentleman introduced H. R. 5125.

Mr. COLMER. Correct.

Mr. CARTER. That was referred to the Committee on Expenditures, which committee struck out all after the enacting clause and wrote a new bill. I would like to know what the difference is between the bill originally introduced by the gentleman and the one we are considering at the present time.

Mr. COLMER. I regret my time will not permit me to go into detail about that. I may say to the gentleman that there has been no substantial change made in the pending bill from that originally introduced by me. That is, the bill introduced by me on June 23 and the bill reported on August 10. There are some clarifying amendments, there are some changes that have been made, but in the over-all management and control of the whole picture there has been no change.

Mr. SABATH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I may say to the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] and to the House, I am satisfied that later on the chairman of the committee reporting the bill and other members of that committee, including the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], will be able to explain the various amendments that have been adopted and explain wherein the bill has been even strengthened over the one originally introduced.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, who is a very able member of the Committee on Expenditures that reported this bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman may tell the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], as I can tell him, that it was in the interest of orderly procedure that the committee struck out all after the enacting clause. There were numerous amendments in there which you may say were clarifying amendments. By making a single amendment out of the substitute it will be easier to consider on the floor of the House.

Mr. COLMER. Quite right, and I thank the gentleman for that contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I think I can safely say this, and if I am incorrect a member of the Committee on Expenditures, such as my distinguished friend from Alabama who has labored so efficiently and long on this matter, can correct me. Your committee shared the desire of all good citizens that disposition of Government surplus property shall be handled in a wide, economical, and efficient manner, that all citizens and business concerns shall have equal opportunity to purchase this property, that it should not be disposed of through speculators in order that some of our citizens may become enriched at the expense of all others.

After many days of careful consideration and painstaking research the

committee is of the opinion that the disposal program is so large and embraces so many hundreds of thousands of various articles that it is impossible for the Congress to legislate in detail. To attempt to do so would defeat the very purposes sought; namely, of protecting the taxpayer without at the same time upsetting the national economy.

Mr. COX. Can the gentleman find it possible in his remaining time to discuss just why an individual has been set up as administrator, rather than providing for the creation of a board? That seems to be the matter about which most of us would like information.

Mr. COLMER. I shall be glad briefly to comment upon my friend's inquiry.

There have been two schools of thought about whether this matter should be handled by one man, an administrator, or by a board. That question was considered by the agencies; it was considered by the two economic post-war committees of the House and Senate; and it was considered by the Committee on Expenditures which reported the pending bill. I think it is safe to say that the best judgment of all those whom I have enumerated and who have considered this proposition is that the most effective manner to handle this is to center the authority, and there is plenty of it, and the discretion, in one man rather than in a board. You would have conflicting opinions, you would have a division of authority, you would have a conflict between the various agencies down here. So it was thought, and the best considered judgment of all, was that this matter should be centered in one head, namely, an administrator. Of course, the administrator is going to have advice. He has told our committee that he is going to get the best advice that he can obtain. He is now getting advice from various boards and agencies, both private and public.

Nobody has any pride of authorship about this matter. We all want to get a job done. That is true of the Post-war Committee; it is true of the Committee on Expenditures. I wonder if I may digress just a moment to say that you have here an unusual situation. You have had two committees jointly considering this matter, giving their best judgment to what ought to be done in connection with it, which I think is a novel procedure and a procedure that will work out, I am sure, most advantageously.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I just want to add this. Some question has been raised about amendments. I think some of the amendments that have been made in the Committee on Expenditures have been good amendments. Speaking for myself individually, if anybody has an amendment that will better obtain the objectives sought in this legislation, then it is his duty to offer it under the 5-minute rule. If anybody can state a better way to do it, then it is his duty to state it. But this is no time for political amendments. This is no time for amendments simply for pride of au-

thorship. This is a bill that the country is intensely interested in, and it ought to get what it is entitled to—the best judgment of this House.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD], a member of the Post-war Economic Policy Committee.

Mr. GIFFORD. Under the rule, a few very general remarks on the bill ought to be appropriate. Of course, we are in favor of this bill. We may need to amend it. I warn some Members that you had better amend it if you want to protect your constituents in your own particular localities. I shall vote for it, but like on some other occasions, I am sorry that I have to do it. How long, how long must I continue to vote to set up Government agencies headed by what we call bureaucrats? How many more? We are told that after we pass this there will come along another to be superimposed upon this one. The administration of this law will be far more important than the law. For many years I have had the idea that Congress should pass laws; and when these laws are disobeyed, an aggrieved party could complain and justice administered. Have we come to the point where we should have a law against thievery and then set up a bureau to supervise and supersede the courts? Must we continue to add to this Frankenstein machinery of government? I should well hesitate. A prominent speaker recently told an audience in my district that he would not vote for any Congressman who voted for another bureaucratic set-up.

This is a real problem, but do not worry too much about this bill. It is easily read. It is rather simple after all. But it is to be a law of the Congress and approves and takes the place of an Executive order. It gives the order standing and permanence. They will then come before the Congress and get the money directly. I do not know, of course, where the money is now coming from to carry on at present. You will find some employees will be under civil-service regulations and the Classification Act. But as to a host of specialists the Administrator will be able to choose and pay them apparently what he may think adequate to get them. I understand Mr. Clayton is the head of the organization at present. I rather expect he will be appointed for these 2 years and his appointment approved by the Senate. But, of course, he comes from Texas, and Texas does not stand well—does it—at present?

There is something lurking in my mind—I do not know what it is—that there may be a danger of his reappointment. Probably my fear is groundless, but does Texas now have influence with the administration? I would not want the country searched for another social worker to head this great merchandising effort. I want a real businessman. I am inclined to say that the administration of this law is the important thing. However, it is to be a law and not an Executive order. Every law, I am told, simply makes more thieves and robbers, as they have to learn new tricks to evade it.

The head of this organization, if he had a little malice in his heart, could easily ruin businesses and individuals. Of course, I believe in one man rather than an independent board. I have in mind a locality contributing 9 percent to the war effort of production, but has few new plants built by the Government. They have built them in other sections of the country, ready to go when the war is over, and this locality will meet terrific competition from the great plants in other sections.

We are trying to define policies in this bill. We have, or did have, the Atlantic Charter. It stated objectives. It contained pious statements that met with great approval. This bill contains splendid statements of policy. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] said, "Do not send surpluses back from foreign countries and dump them to the ruin of our own industries." The only trouble with that statement is that he does not tell us what to do with that surplus overseas. Perhaps he will tell us later. But I am wondering what we will do. Mr. Clayton says he has sold some surplus property and that he has done it for cash only. We have a big international banking bill coming along. The manufacturers here may then export and expect this bank to arrange payment so other nations could exchange their currencies for our dollars. I am inclined to think there is some virtue in that. If our own manufacturers could get the money from ourselves, it would seem to be in line with that strange doctrine that I have had indoctrinated in me during the last 10 or 12 years, "What of our national debt; don't we owe it to ourselves?" The idea that everyone should expect the Government to look after them is gaining impetus. We are thinking about the unemployment insurance problem that the Committee on Ways and Means is considering. How liberal are we to be? Indeed, how this administration has indoctrinated everybody with the idea that the Government should look after them. This reminds me of the story about the contractor and the little daughter whose father was injured on the job. The contractor said, "How long will it be before father will come back to work?" She said, "I do not think for a long time. Compensation has set in."

Contemplate the groups who have been banding themselves together, the discontented, the disgruntled, the Communists, all sorts of—what would you call them, left wingers—so-called radicals. I do not know what to call them. They are American citizens, apparently. They have indorsed this dangerous doctrine. Some fled from their former governments, and they come over here and try to indoctrinate us with the same form of government from which they themselves desired to escape.

I am trying to make a few general statements under the rule. I am trying to give warning of the trend of events and enlarging powers of the Government. We will discuss the bill later. It is not a difficult bill to understand.

I want to pay a high tribute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COL-

MER]. He has done a splendid job. I have not been present at many of the hearings. It is very fortunate for him, and for me, that I was not, because I might have hindered, I might have asked questions. But I have read most of the hearings and I think it is more profitable to read than to be influenced by the gestures and the facial expressions of the man who is making the argument. You might be unduly influenced and form a prejudiced opinion. Mr. Clayton might have won me over so completely with his first few statements that I would not need to hear anything more. Certainly, we have confidence in him.

However, we may well fear that malice, prejudice, and human frailties may enter into decisions, and you Congressmen, after this bill is passed, will be besieged by your constituents, "The Government took our land. You see to it that we get it back at the same price or a less price." There will be all sorts of requests from them. We will again have another bureaucrat, and another bureaucratic organization. Our lives are now dedicated to appealing to bureaucrats, such as the O. P. A. and others, trying to get some relief for our constituents.

Here is another highly important thing. We do not want to injure the market. But we should dispose of a lot of this surplus material now while people have the money and while there is a shortage of consumer goods. Let us not wait and then 3 years from now dump it when everybody needs a job. We must see that this property is disposed of in such a manner that it will not harm those who need employment, but does anybody know how to do it? Let us get it into the hands of the proper dealers, and into the hands of the storekeepers, while there is need for it and while there would be as little dislocation as possible. Later we would be trying to carry water on both shoulders.

We will discuss the details of the bill later on in general debate.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT-ELECT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 40, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the joint committee to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1945, the following Members of the House: Mr. RAYBURN, Mr. DOUGHTON, and Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the remarks I shall make in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon I may be permitted to include certain tables, excerpts, and laws.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein some statements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5125) to provide for the disposal of surplus Government property and plants, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5125, with Mr. THOMASON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the report has gone throughout the Nation that the Congress has been derelict in its duty in not making studies of the problems of reconversion that face our country immediately upon the cessation of hostilities, which we all hope will be in the not-far-distant future. I want to give you a little history of the background.

In February 1943 we started hearings in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on the bill H. R. 1610. We held hearings for about 3 months on that bill. On the 9th day of June 1943, we passed H. R. 2795, which was a rewrite of H. R. 1610.

Since that time other committees have been making studies of the disposal of surplus war plants, lands, and so forth. Extensive hearings have been held in the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds on the disposition of lands and war plants. The Patman small-business committee held extensive hearings on this question. The Post-war Planning Committee, of which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] is chairman, held extensive hearings. All Government agencies that have or expect to have surplus properties have been making studies of this problem. The industries, the consumers, the labor organizations have been making studies, and their recommendations have been made available to our committee.

At the outset may I say that this is not a perfect bill. No bill that can be written will answer all the questions. Our committee endeavored to deal with this problem as a national problem, not as a local problem. This surplus property belongs to all the people of the United

States and not to particular localities. We have had recommendations placed before our committee to earmark certain of the surpluses. We have turned down those recommendations because we feel that if you open the gate for any group to get in and obtain surpluses free, you will not be able to resist the pressure of all other groups to turn property over to them free.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. I desire to call the gentleman's attention to the provision contained in the Labor-Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1945, which read as follows:

Provided further, That any personal property formerly belonging to the National Youth Administration and loaned to any public school, school system, or institution of higher education within any State under the provisions of Public Law 140, Seventy-eighth Congress, under the heading "War Manpower Commission," shall vest in, be, and become the property of such school, school system, or institution of higher education in which such property is located.

Is it or is it not the gentleman's opinion that there is anything in the bill as reported by his committee which would have the effect of repealing that provision of the Labor-Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act?

Mr. MANASCO. No; nothing in this bill would repeal that.

Mr. TARVER. Following that question up, the gentleman has just expressed himself as being against the provision in this legislation of anything which would authorize the donation of any of the various items or surplus property dealt with by the pending bill. May I ask the gentleman if there is in his judgment any difference in principle between the donation of National Youth Administration property, concerning which Congress has already expressed itself, and for the donation of which it has already provided, and the donation of equipment used in the training of war workers in vocational education training to local and State vocational education systems? Why should not the pending bill grant authority to the Administrator to donate, in cases where it is felt that it is justifiable to donate, property of that type to State and local school systems, and also some school buildings owned by the Federal Government?

Mr. MANASCO. And hospitals also.

Mr. TARVER. They have been constructed entirely at Federal expense in communities where the school population has increased largely because of war industries. The major portion of those buildings have become part of local school systems, but some of them, as I am advised, are still the property of the Federal Government. Why should not there be authority in the Administrator to donate, without requiring full payment therefor, these particular buildings where they are needed in connection with the local school systems? What would there be in such a provision which has not already been approved by the Congress in passing the law with reference to the disposition of N. Y. A. property?

Mr. MANASCO. May I say to my friend, the gentleman from Georgia, if I recall the background with reference to the disposal of N. Y. A. properties, at the time the Congress refused to extend the life of the N. Y. A., their argument for justifying the extension of their life was that they were training war workers. I may not be stating the true background, but in my opinion the true background for authorizing these tools to be donated to these schools was to let our industrial schools, our high schools, and our colleges avail themselves of those tools so they could train war workers.

Mr. TARVER. Why should not that be done in the case of this other equipment to which I have referred?

Mr. MANASCO. We hope we will not have to be training war workers in the next 2 or 3 years. We hope when this enormous surplus starts to be disposed of, we will not be training war workers.

Mr. TARVER. Of course. Then why not turn over that equipment to local schools for educational and vocational training purposes?

Mr. MANASCO. But if the Congress in its wisdom desires to give away this surplus property we will have nothing left to apply to the staggering war debt.

Mr. TARVER. Then do I understand the gentleman to express himself clearly as being opposed to the donation of this equipment which has been used in the training of war workers to local vocational-school purposes?

Mr. MANASCO. If the gentleman will permit me to express my opinion, it is that if you are going to give anything to anybody, let us give it all away.

Mr. TARVER. In other words, the gentleman would not be in favor of permitting the donation of such equipment to local vocational and educational schools unless we give all Government surplus property away?

Mr. MANASCO. I think our farmers would be entitled to free donation of jeeps and trucks and other equipment.

Mr. TARVER. I regret very much to hear the gentleman express that opinion, because I am very hopeful the House will decide before the conclusion of the consideration of this bill to authorize the donation of this surplus equipment to local educational systems.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Georgia some time to express his point of view. I just want to call to the attention of the Congress some things that happened after the last war. We are trying to profit by the sad mistakes that were made after the last war. There was no orderly disposition of surpluses after the last war. Every few days Congress would pass a new law or an Executive order would be issued to give away certain equipment. The ultimate result was that the taxpayers did not recover much to apply to the war debt at that time, which was infinitesimal as compared to the present war debt.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I want to place in the RECORD some brief excerpts of Executive orders and laws:

EXHIBIT

ACTS OF CONGRESS, ETC., AUTHORIZING DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS WAR SUPPLIES, ETC., AFTER WORLD WAR NO. 1

Executive Order No. 3012, of November 29, 1918, provided that all surplus materials, supplies, and equipment not required for use by the executive departments, etc., in Washington should be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury for reissue or sale on requisition to the Government service, through the General Supply Committee, or for condemnation and sale to the highest bidders when deemed expedient, and authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to make rules and regulations to carry out this order. (Repealed by Executive Order No. 3019, below.)

Executive Order No. 3019, of December 8, 1918 (U. S. C. 40: 311a, note), provides:

"Whereas, the present emergency has created a condition whereby large quantities of office material, supplies, and equipment now in the hands of the executive departments and other establishments of the Government in the District of Columbia will fall into disuse because of the cessation of war activities, or for other reasons, it hereby is ordered that all such office materials, supplies, and equipment not required for use by the executive departments and independent establishments be transferred hereafter to the Secretary of the Treasury, to be handled through the General Supply Committee for the benefit of the municipal government and the governmental service in the District of Columbia in the following manner:

"1. The several executive departments and independent establishments and the municipal government in the District of Columbia shall not purchase any of the classes of material described herein unless the Secretary of the Treasury has certified that there is not in the possession of the Government material, equipment, or supplies that are serviceable.

"2. No executive department, independent establishment, or the municipal government of the District of Columbia shall be permitted to obtain any of the classes of material, supplies, and equipment described herein from the Secretary of the Treasury unless such services have an appropriation available for the procurement thereof.

"3. All material obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury shall be paid for by transfer of appropriation from the purchasing service to the selling service and the proceeds covered into the Treasury in accordance with existing law.

"4. All material, supplies, and equipment purchased hereunder by one service from another, if the same has not been used, shall be sold at actual cost, and if the same has been used, at a cost based upon length of usage, but in no instance to be less than 75 percent of cost.

"5. Material of the classes herein described which is condemned as unfit for use may be disposed of otherwise than to governmental services by the Secretary of the Treasury. And usable material remaining unsold to other services of the Government shall be held by him for disposition by law.

"6. The Secretary of the Treasury shall keep a record of all material received and disposed of by him hereunder and the price at which disposed of, and shall prescribe the regulations necessary to carry this order into effect.

"7. This order shall supersede the Executive order of November 29, 1918, dealing with the same subject matter."

An act of February 25, 1919 (40 Stat. 1163) and Treasury Department Appropriation Acts of May 29, 1920 (41 Stat. 644-645) through March 5, 1928 (45 Stat. 164) continued the

Executive order of December 3, 1918, in effect until June 30, 1929, without modification, except that proceeds from transfer of appropriations were to be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, and that beginning February 17, 1922, a provision was added requiring that the price charged should be the current market value at time of issue, less a discount of not more than 25 percent for usage. Finally, the Treasury Department Appropriation Act of December 20, 1928 (45 Stat. 1030; U. S. C. 40:311a) provides:

"The Executive order of December 3, 1918, shall apply to all materials, supplies, and equipment now or hereafter becoming surplus or unusable in any executive department or independent Government establishment in the District of Columbia and shall continue in effect hereafter without modification, except that the prices charged for reissued surplus materials, supplies, and equipment, shall be the estimated current market value at time of issue, and that the proceeds from the transfer of appropriations thereunder shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided*, That the heads of the executive departments and independent establishments and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia hereafter shall cooperate with the Secretary of the Treasury in connection with the storage and delivery of material, supplies, and equipment transferred under the foregoing provisions."

The Post Office Department Appropriation Act of February 28, 1919 (40 Stat. 1200, sec. 4), provided:

"Sec. 4. That the Postmaster General and other responsible officials, in expending appropriations contained in this act, so far as possible shall purchase material, supplies, and equipment, when needed and funds are available, from the various services of the Government of the United States possessing material, supplies, and equipment no longer required because of the cessation of war activities. It shall be the duty of the Postmaster General and other officials, before purchasing any of the articles described herein, to ascertain from the other services of the Government whether they have articles of the character described that are serviceable. And articles purchased from other services of the Government, if the same have not been used, shall be paid for at a reasonable price not to exceed actual cost, and if the same have been used, at a reasonable price based upon length of usage. The various services of the Government are authorized to sell such articles to the Postal Service under the conditions specified and the proceeds of such sales shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt."

Similar provisions are contained in the following appropriation acts: Legislative, Executive, and Judicial, March 1, 1919 (40 Stat. 1268 sec. 8), Deficiency, July 11, 1919 (41 Stat. 67, sec. 5; U. S. C. 40: 311); District of Columbia (41 Stat. 103 sec. 7), which includes food supplies, as well as materials, etc., Sundry civil, July 19, 1919 (41 Stat. 232 sec. 3).

An act of February 25, 1919 (40 Stat. 1174) directed the Secretary of War to transfer to the Secretary of the Navy for the use of the Marine Corps, without payment, such reserve stock of clothing, arms, and equipment, and other necessary supplies, inventoried at the cost to the Army and not to exceed in the aggregate \$7,000,000, as the same from time to time might be requisitioned.

An act of February 28, 1919 (40 Stat. 1194) directed the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to deliver immediately to the Postmaster General, at his request, such airplane machines, supplies, equipment, and parts as may be serviceable and available for the airplane mail service, out of any

War or Navy Department equipment on hand or under construction, the appropriations of the two departments to be credited with the equipment turned over to the Post Office Department.

This act (p. 1201, sec. 7) also authorized the Secretary of War to transfer to the Secretary of Agriculture all available war material, equipment, and supplies not needed by the War Department, but suitable for road construction and provided that the same should be distributed among the highway departments of the States for use on Federal-aid highways. The Secretary of Agriculture could reserve 10 percent of such material, etc., for use on national forest roads, etc. The Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 213 sec. 5), directed the Secretary of War to transfer to the Secretary of Agriculture, upon his request, all such war material, etc., declared surplus from stock then on hand, etc. An act of April 9, 1924 (43 Stat. 90 c. 86 sec. 3) authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to reserve, in addition to the above 10 percent, 5 percent for transfer to the Secretary of the Interior for construction of roads and trails in national parks and monuments. (See also act of March 15, 1920, below.)

An act of March 3, 1919 (40 Stat. 1303 sec. 3; U. S. C. 42: 43) directed the Secretary of War "to transfer without charge to the Secretary of the Treasury for the use of the Public Health Service such hospital furniture and equipment, including hospital and medical supplies, motor trucks, and other motor-driven vehicles, in good condition, not required by the War Department, as may be required by the Public Health Service for its hospitals, and the President is authorized to direct the transfer to the Treasury Department of the use of such lands or parts of lands, buildings, fixtures, appliances, furnishings, or furniture under the control of any other department of the Government not required for the purposes of such department and suitable for the uses of the Public Health Service."

(See also act of March 15, 1920, below.)

The Victory Liberty Loan Act of March 3, 1919 (40 Stat. 1312 sec. 7) authorized the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, until eighteen months after the war, to extend credits to any of our allies to enable them to purchase Government property not needed by the United States and any wheat for which the price was not guaranteed.

An act of July 11, 1919 (41 Stat. 105, U. S. C. 10: 1265) provided that in addition to the delivery of property theretofore authorized to be delivered to the Public Health Service, the Department of Agriculture and the Post Office Department, the Secretary of War might sell any surplus supplies, including motortrucks and automobiles, then owned by the Government for use of the War Department, to any State or municipal division thereof, or to any corporation or individual, upon such terms as might be deemed best.

An act of July 11, 1919 (41 Stat. 130 ch. IV, U. S. C. 10: 1251) authorizes the Secretary of War to turn over, on request from other executive departments, without charge therefor, such ammunition, explosives, and other ammunition components as may become surplus or unsuitable for War Department purposes. An act of July 19, 1919 (41 Stat. 193) authorized the Secretary of War to transfer, without charge, to the Secretary of the Interior, explosives and explosive material for which the War Department had no further use.

The act of July 11, 1919 (p. 130, ch.-IV) also authorizes the Secretary of War to place at the disposal of the American Red Cross, medical and surgical supplies and supple-

mentary and dietary foodstuffs in Europe not essential to the expeditionary forces or military hospitals in the United States, etc., to relieve and supply pressing needs of peoples involved in the war; the Secretary was to prescribe regulations and conditions for selection and delivery of such supplies and foodstuffs.

An act of July 11, 1919 (41 Stat. 132, U. S. C. 10: 1274) authorizes interchange without compensation therefor, of military stores, supplies, and equipment of every character, including real estate, between the Army and the Navy upon the request of the head of one service and the approval of the head of the other service.

An act of July 19, 1919 (41 Stat. 181) authorized the disposition of any material or plant acquired by the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation as the President might direct. (Executive Order No. 3145 of August 11, 1919, conferred this power upon the Shipping Board. It directed the Board, in its discretion to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such materials (including stores, supplies, and equipment for ships) and plants, or any portions thereof, by public or private sale or contract, with or without notice, in such lots, at such times and places, and upon such credit, security, and other terms or conditions, and in such manner as said Board should deem to be the best advantage of the United States, either directly by the Board, the Fleet Corporation, or through any other corporation organized for the purpose.)

An act of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 988-996) authorized the Shipping Board to sell all property, other than vessels, which had been acquired by the President under certain acts, upon such terms and conditions as the Board might direct. Proceeds, with certain exceptions, were to be covered into the Treasury.

An act of July 19, 1919 (41 Stat. 224) provided for the sale and conveyance of all property acquired under the War Housing Act of May 16, 1918 (40 Stat. 550-553) and remaining undisposed of after the termination of the war. Section 5 of this act (p. 233; U. S. C. 10: 1267) provides:

"Sec. 5. The Secretary of War is authorized to transfer any unused and surplus motor-propelled vehicles and motor equipment of any kind, the payment for same to be made as provided herein, to any branch of the Government service having appropriations available for the purchase of said vehicles and equipment: *Provided*, That in case of the transfers herein authorized a reasonable price not to exceed actual cost, and if the same have been used, at a reasonable price based upon length of usage, shall be determined upon and an equivalent amount of each appropriation available for said purchase shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt, and the appropriation in each case reduced accordingly: *Provided further*, That it shall be the duty of each official of the Government having such purchases in charge to procure the same from any such unused or surplus stock if possible: *Provided further*, That hereafter no transfer of motor-propelled vehicles and motor equipment, unless specifically authorized by law, shall be made free of charge to any branch of the Government service."

An act of November 19, 1919 (41 Stat. 360, ch. 118; U. S. C. 20: 93), authorizes the Secretary of War under such regulations as he may prescribe, to sell at 15 percent of their cost, to trade, technical, and public schools and universities, etc., machine tools under the control of the War Department and not needed for Government purposes. The proceeds are to be used to defray expenses incident to distribution, except cost of transportation, and the balance is to be turned into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts,

provided that title is to revert to the United States if such institution offers such material for sale without the consent of the Secretary.

An act of March 6, 1920 (41 Stat. 504), authorized the Secretary of War to transfer to the Federal Board for Vocational Education, without compensation therefor, certain surplus machine tools and equipment of the War Department then being used by the Board as equipment for schools. Property so transferred was to be dropped from the records of the War Department on the filing of an itemized receipt for articles transferred. An itemized statement of items transferred and the cost price were to be reported to Congress by the Secretary. (An act of May 29, 1928 (45 Stat. 988), provided for discontinuance of reports to Congress.)

An act of March 15, 1920 (41 Stat. 530-531; U. S. Code 23:51, 52; 39:502, 503; 42:43-45) directs the Secretary of War to transfer such motor-propelled vehicles and motor equipment, including spare parts, as were or may be found to be surplus to (a) the Department of Agriculture for road work under section 7 of the act of February 28, 1919, above, provided the Department of Agriculture certifies that it can be used for such purposes within a reasonable time, (b) the Post Office Department for use in transmission of the mails, and (c) the Treasury Department for use by the Public Health Service under section 3 of the act of March 3, 1919, above. The Secretary was directed to transfer certain specified surplus road-making materials to the Department of Agriculture (sec. 2) and surplus telephone supplies to the Department of Agriculture for the Forest Service (sec. 3). The War Department was not to pay freight charges and was to be reimbursed for loading expense; States were to pay to the Department of Agriculture 20 percent of the estimated value of property received by them, against which sum the States could set off freight charges paid by them. Title to vehicles and equipment is to vest in the State for road work and is not to be sold, but the State may rent same to State agencies or municipal corporations for road work.

Acts of April 24, 1920, and of March 1, 1921 (41 Stat. 584, sec. 7; 41 Stat. 1155, sec. 2; U. S. Code 23:50) authorize the Secretary of War, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to loan to any State, tractors not distributed under the act of March 15, 1920, for road construction, the expense of repairs and upkeep and of loading and freight to be paid by the State.

The Military Academy appropriation of March 30, 1920 (41 Stat. 547) directed the Secretary of War to turn over to the United States Military Academy, without expense, all such surplus material as might be available and necessary for construction of buildings and surplus tools and matériel for use in instruction of cadets. (This provision was repeated in subsequent acts through May 28, 1930, 46 Stat. 451.)

An act of April 17, 1920 (41 Stat. 554, c. 150; U. S. Code 10:1266) directs the Secretary of War to sell at public or private sale, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, all dental outfits in excess of the needs of the Government, preferentially to licensed dentists who served in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or the American Red Cross during World War No. 1, but not more than one set of dental supplies is to be sold at private sale to any one person.

An act of April 23, 1920 (41 Stat. 573 c. 159) authorized the Secretary of War to sell for cash at the prevailing market price, from one to one hundred tons to any one purchaser, and aggregating not more than 100,000 tons, nitrate of soda then held as a reserve supply of the War Department, the proceeds of sale to be repaid to the proper item of current appropriations originally made for

such purposes. The Secretary was to report to Congress not later than December 6, 1920, the names of all purchasers and prices for which sold.

An act of May 29, 1920 (41 Stat. 688, sec. 4), provided that all purchases of typewriting machines during the fiscal year 1921, except as thereafter provided, should be made from the surplus machines in the stock of the General Supply Committee. The War Department was to furnish the General Supply Committee a complete inventory of makes, models, and classes of typewriters in its possession, the condition of such machines and the point of storage, and was to turn over to the committee machines in such quantities as the Secretary of the Treasury might call for by special requisition for sale to the various services of the Government. If the committee was unable to furnish serviceable machines it was to furnish unserviceable ones at current exchange prices and machines were to be traded in as part payment for new machines. Until June 30, 1921, the War Department was not to dispose of any typewriters except to the committee. No typewriters that had been used less than 3 years were to be traded in. (This last provision is repeated in an act of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 947; U. S. C. 41: 27). These provisions, except the last two sentences, were repeated in subsequent Treasury Department appropriation acts through March 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 139). The provision requiring purchase of typewriters from surplus stock of the General Supply Committee, etc., was repeated in subsequent Treasury Department appropriation acts through February 23, 1931 (46 Stat. 1219).

The Naval Service Appropriation Acts of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 835), and July 12, 1921 (42 Stat. 132), direct the accounting officers of the Treasury to credit "general account of advances" with the amount of net losses certified by the Paymaster General of the Navy as having been incurred in disposing of excess stocks.

An act of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 949; U. S. C. 10: 1262), authorizes the Secretary of War to sell to any state or foreign government with which the United States is at peace, upon such terms as he may deem expedient, any material, supplies, or equipment, except foodstuffs, as may be found to be surplus, which are not needed for military purposes and for which there is no adequate domestic market.

An act of June 30, 1921 (42 Stat. 68), authorized the Secretary of War to sell to any foreign state or government with which the United States was at peace, upon such terms as he might deem expedient, any surplus foodstuffs for which there was no adequate domestic market. (Repeated in act of June 20, 1922, 42 Stat. 717.)

An act of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 973), directed the Secretary of War to issue from surplus stores and material, such articles of Army clothing and equipment and field artillery matériel and ammunition as might be needed by the National Guard, without charge to the militia appropriations. (Similar provisions have been contained in subsequent appropriations through June 30, 1941, 55 Stat. 386.)

An act of June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 1015, sec. 8; U. S. C. 10: 1257, 1311), authorizes the Secretary of War to transfer, free of charge, to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, for use in the execution of civil works, such material, supplies, instruments, vehicles, machinery, or other equipment as may be found to be surplus.

An act of March 3, 1921 (41 Stat. 1231), provided that motor-propelled vehicles for the Indian Service were to be purchased from the War Department if practicable. (This provision was repeated in subsequent acts through Mar. 3, 1925, 43 Stat. 1147.)

An act of March 4, 1921 (41 Stat. 1365; U. S. C. 42: 43), directs the Secretary of War to

transfer, without charge, to the Secretary of the Treasury for the use of the Public Health Service such mechanical, construction, and miscellaneous material, hospital furniture and equipment, hospital and medical supplies, motortrucks and other motor-driven vehicles, not required by the War Department, as may be required by the Public Health Service for hospitals.

An act of June 16, 1921 (42 Stat. 37), provided that certain surplus property not required for the War Department and any suitable surplus property of the Navy Department be transferred for use in constructing, equipping, and supplying hospitals for disabled soldiers.

An act of August 9, 1921 (42 Stat. 149, sec. 9), authorized the Director of the Veterans' Bureau to use facilities of the Navy, War, and Interior Departments, the Public Health Service, the National Home for Disabled Soldiers, etc., and directed such governmental agencies to furnish such facilities, including necessary personnel, equipment, medical, surgical, and hospital services and supplies. (Superseded by similar acts of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 610, sec. 10), and July 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 790, ch. 723; U. S. C. 38: 434), which authorize the Director, at the direction of the President, or with the approval of the head of the department concerned to utilize such facilities and authorize such governmental agencies to furnish facilities, equipment, supplies, etc.)

An act of January 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 357, ch. 30), authorized the President to transfer, without charge, \$4,000,000 worth of surplus medical and hospital supplies of the War and other Departments to American relief organizations for transportation, without cost to the United States, for relief in Russia.

An act of February 17, 1922 (42 Stat. 369), provides that typewriters and computing machines transferred to the General Supply Committee as surplus, where such machines are unfit for further use, may in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury be issued to other Government departments and establishments at exchange prices quoted in current general schedule of supplies or sold commercially. (This provision was repeated in subsequent acts through Dec. 20, 1928, 45 Stat. 1030; U. S. C. 40: 812.)

An act of May 24, 1922 (43 Stat. 561), provided that the War and Navy Departments and the United States Shipping Board, upon request and without charge, turn over to the Indian Service surplus food, clothing, and other supplies to relieve destitution among the Indians.

An appropriation act of June 30, 1922 (42 Stat. 719-720), provided that uniforms and other equipment or material issued to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps were to be furnished from surplus stocks of the War Department, without payment except for expense incurred in manufacture or issue, and that the amount paid from this appropriation for such uniforms was not to exceed current prices. (Similar provisions have been contained in subsequent appropriation acts through July 2, 1942, Public No. 649.)

This same act contained a similar provision as to uniforms, etc., for civilian military training camps. (Similar provisions have been contained in subsequent appropriation acts through June 13, 1940, 54 Stat. 376.)

An act of June 20, 1922 (42 Stat. 717), provided that War Department funds were not to be used to transfer surplus property to other agencies when articles were located at a place where surplus quantities were so small that transfer would not be economical. (This provision was repeated each year through May 28, 1930, 46 Stat. 434.)

An act of June 30, 1922 (42 Stat. 765), provided that the Governor of the Panama Canal should purchase needed materials, when it was economical, from available surplus or reserve stocks of the War Department. (This

provision was repeated in subsequent acts through Feb. 28, 1929, 45 Stat. 1366.)

Acts of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 533, sec. 1), and March 8, 1925 (43 Stat. 1211), authorized the Director of the Veterans' Bureau to sell at 60 percent of appraised value, to vocational schools, etc., surplus materials then owned by the Government and under the control of the Bureau.

The following provisions of law relating to disposal of public property were in force at the end of World War No. 1:

R. S. 197 (U. S. Code 5: 109) provides that the Secretaries of War and of the Navy (among other Secretaries) shall keep, in proper books, a complete inventory of all the property belonging to the United States in the buildings, rooms, offices, and grounds occupied by them and under their charge, adding thereto, from time to time, an account of such property as may be procured subsequently, as well as an account of the sale or other disposition of any such property.

R. S. 3618 (U. S. Code 31: 487) provides that proceeds of sales of supplies or other public property of any kind, with certain exceptions, shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, on account of "proceeds of Government property" and shall not be withdrawn or applied, except in consequence of a subsequent appropriation made by law.

An act of July 2, 1918 (40 Stat. 753, sec. 8), amended by an act of April 24, 1920 (41 Stat. 583, sec. 3; U. S. C. 39: 504), authorizes the Secretary of War to turn over to the Postmaster General airplanes, automobiles, etc., unsuitable for purposes of the War Department.

An act of July 8, 1918 (40 Stat. 817; U. S. C. 53: 60), provides that such naval ordnance, etc., as the Secretaries of War and of the Navy may determine necessary, may be transferred from the Navy Department to the War Department. If such ordnance, etc., is obsolete for naval purposes the transfer is to be made without reimbursement, etc.; otherwise transfers are to be made only after a specific appropriation for payment has been made.

In addition to the above, there are provisions of law authorizing disposal of obsolete property of ships, or of real property which have been omitted. The following acts provide for disposal of specific property, for transfer of property to certain institutions or for disposal of property in a particular locality: Act of February 25, 1919 (40 Stat. 1163), July 11, 1919 (41 Stat. 57), July 19, 1919 (41 Stat. 205, 206), May 29, 1920 (41 Stat. 652, 663, 677), June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 1035; U. S. C. 40: 186), March 3, 1921 (41 Stat. 1349), March 4, 1921 (41 Stat. 438, ch. 166; U. S. C. 20: 60), June 30, 1921 (42 Stat. 81), January 12, 1922 (42 Stat. 638), January 3, 1923 (42 Stat. 1079), January 5, 1923 (42 Stat. 1115), February 13, 1923 (42 Stat. 1232), and March 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 1281, ch. 539), March 3, 1921 (41 Stat. 1260, 1273, 1281).

I notice one act here provides for the transfer of foods. We have had pressure brought to bear to give away food. When you start giving away one commodity you open the floodgates. It might be interesting to the Members to know something about how much surplus we will have on hand when the war is over.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks here so we will have some idea of the problem that confronts us.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Before the gentleman completes his very interesting discussion of these so-called donations, would not the right principle for Congress to have in mind be that when they

use any property for any purpose it is just the same as using the taxpayers' money, if the purpose is such that they would have originally appropriated money for it? If it is a school or for any other purpose, then the Congress would be justified in appropriating the property. But this property cannot be given away. It does not belong to the Congress to give away. It is the subject of an appropriation to dispose of in one way or another in the best interests of the country.

Mr. MANASCO. Of course, I think Congress has authority to enact laws to give it all away.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In that connection, is it not true under section 11 of the bill, which outlines the policies governing disposition, the Administrator can fix the price that he thinks certain public agencies should pay, in the interest of the public welfare, and give priority first to Federal agencies and then to State agencies and political subdivisions and cooperative and charitable or eleemosynary organizations?

Mr. MANASCO. That is to fulfill a legitimate need.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In that connection, the gentleman representing a rural district, I am sure is quite familiar with the valuable work done by volunteer fire companies. They have a quasi-public standing because they are recognized by most of the States and in a sense they might be called a cooperative organization as mentioned in section 11. Would the gentleman have any objection to adding to those specifically enumerated the words "volunteer fire companies," and putting those that can purchase essential fire-fighting equipment on a priority basis?

Mr. MANASCO. I think they would be covered in the bill under a liberal interpretation of the provisions of the bill. I do not think an amendment is needed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But would there be any objection to them being specifically named?

Mr. MANASCO. I cannot speak for the full committee.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman be kind enough to yield? I dislike to take so much of the gentleman's time, but I would like to make this point clear if possible. The gentleman has referred to the authority contained in section 11. However, section 10 (b) expressly provides that there can be no donation of any of this property unless it is worthless for commercial purposes or unless the cost of its care and dismantling is greater than the amount received.

Mr. MANASCO. That is correct.

Mr. TARVER. So that the authority to which the gentleman refers in section 11 is merely the authority to sell and not the authority to donate?

Mr. MANASCO. That is correct. It is merely the authority to sell.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield and permit one further interruption inasmuch as he has been interrupted?

Mr. MANASCO. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. PACE. I am disturbed because I have received different answers to this question. What is the gentleman's understanding under this bill of the handling and disposition of agricultural surpluses in which the farmers of this Nation are very greatly interested?

Mr. MANASCO. They cannot be given away.

Mr. PACE. I do not mean that they will be given away. I mean will the War Food Administrator, as the holding agency, or will the Surplus Property Administrator control their disposition?

Mr. MANASCO. The Surplus Property Administrator controls the disposition. He is not going to be the disposing agent. He has authority to delegate that authority to the War Food Administrator if he sees fit, or to any operating agency.

Mr. PACE. But he will determine the question of prices and policies?

Mr. MANASCO. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. It is not the policy, as outlined in this measure, to turn over property of a certain character en bloc, to some organization in order that that organization may dispose of it at great commercial profit, is it?

Mr. MANASCO. No, sir. No, sir. As I started to say a few minutes ago, there have been misunderstandings as to the amount of surplus that will be on hand when the war is over.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 15 minutes.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Of course, nobody living can today state exactly how much surplus we will have. Most of this surplus is expendable. If the war lasts much longer, the surpluses, unless we produce more, will be dismissed. We have had estimates ranging anywhere from sixty to one hundred and five billion dollars as the amount of surpluses there will be on hand when the war is over. Of course, the average person reading those figures thinks we will have \$105,000,000,000 worth of surplus property that can be used in our domestic economy. I think that a false impression and a dangerous impression to go out through the country. As a matter of fact, not all the combat planes that are declared surplus by the War and Navy Departments will be sold in the commercial market. A civilian could not afford to operate a P-38 or P-47, a B-17, a B-24, a B-25, B-26, or B-29. Those planes are going to be almost a total loss to the taxpayers of the United States. We will not be able to realize anything from them.

Tanks, landing craft, battleships, combat ships, of which we will have an enormous amount of surplus, all that can be realized out of them is what can be salvaged for scrap.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is there any provision in the law to prevent our disposing of these surplus war materials to other governments?

Mr. MANASCO. No, sir.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. In the past there have been some scandals in that respect, in which we have furnished other governments with means to fight us or fight each other. I think that is one matter that should be controlled.

Mr. MANASCO. That is true. There is nothing in this act that will prevent our selling them.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. There is nothing in the bill that would authorize the sinking of war vessels, without the action of the Congress, is there?

Mr. MANASCO. No, sir. The operating agency must declare property surplus before it can be sold by the Surplus Property Administrator. If the War Department decides to hold these planes and tanks and ordnance off the market, the Surplus Property Administrator will not have control over them.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In reply to the question asked by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vorys], is not the very first objective of this bill the disposition of surplus property to promote national defense of the United States? So that no war property could be disposed of if the Army and the Navy and executive agencies of the Government advise us that it can be used against us or against our defense?

Mr. MANASCO. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Is there any provision in the bill authorizing the Administrator or anybody under him to dispose of individual units to farmers? For instance, a jeep.

Mr. MANASCO. He has that authority under this bill. He has authority to sell a can of tomatoes.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. If this bill authorizes somebody to dispose of great quantities to somebody else and make a profit out of it, then the individual farmer is not going to get in on this. We want to fix it so that a man can go and buy an individual unit, such as a jeep or something like that.

Mr. MANASCO. He can do that under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Without having to pay somebody a big profit?

Mr. MANASCO. Yes, sir. He certainly can.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Certainly until the war is over, and probably until a great deal of this property is disposed of, prices are all fixed, and no matter whether it is sold directly to the farmer, a truck or an automobile, the price will be fixed,

so that he will not have to pay any more whether it is sold directly or indirectly.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. PACE. That happens to be not the policy today when the farmer wants to buy a second-hand Army truck. In the first place he cannot buy it himself. He has to get it through a dealer. There can be slight repairs and an increase in the price of from 10 to 25 percent. If that is going to be the policy with regard to jeeps for the farmers and airplanes for the returning flyers, then somebody is going to make a huge profit under this bill. As I understood the committee, one of the purposes of the bill was to prevent unconscionable profits being made by people scooping up these surpluses and then retailing them out at big advances in price.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman certainly understands we are not fixing prices. Unless prices are obtained otherwise, it would not be applicable under this bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I would like to make a general statement about this bill before we start discussing the different sections, just to give you some of the background which our committee studied before we prepared the bill.

A few moments ago I was discussing the amount of available surpluses. The highest estimate of personal property—that is, exclusive of war plants, and so forth—was about \$15,000,000,000. But, of course, this Surplus Property Administrator will have in his power the absolute power of destruction of certain industries in this country if he does not exercise reasonable discretion in the disposal of these surpluses. Take the canning industry, for instance: We will have on hand enough canned goods to absolutely destroy the canning industry in this country. If you start earmarking for any particular organization, the people who will be thrown out of work when the war is over should have an opportunity to have canned goods and foodstuffs given to them. If you are going to earmark for anybody I think the hungry man should be thought of first. When you earmark for the farmer trucks and jeeps and turn around and earmark for the consumer your surplus foods and canned goods, woolen blankets, shoes, and so forth, who suffers? The farmer. His market for the things he hopes to produce will be beaten down. That happened after the last war. We do not want that to happen again. That is the reason we want an orderly disposal of these surpluses. When you start opening the floodgates, do not forget Members of Congress are going to be hounded to death about these surpluses.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. What is in my mind at the present time has to do with certain surpluses. There are perhaps

thousands of items to be disposed of. I am thinking of such surpluses as may be usable for the schools and universities.

Mr. MANASCO. We have discussed that. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TAVEL] called attention to that.

Mr. DINGELL. Under the National Youth Administration plan there is very, very fine disposition of a limited amount of material in the hands of the National Youth Administration. Is that not going to be the guiding policy in this bill?

Mr. MANASCO. This bill does not authorize the Administrator to give anything away, except material that is worn beyond repair or has no commercial value.

Mr. DINGELL. In other words, certain things that our schools could use for the benefit of the youth of the land, no provision is made for disposition of that material?

Mr. MANASCO. No, sir.

Mr. DINGELL. There is no prohibition, however, in the bill against it, is there?

Mr. MANASCO. The administrator must sell for cash or something of value.

Mr. DINGELL. Then that is quite specific.

Mr. MANASCO. As I said a moment ago, this property belongs to the people all over the United States, not just one local community like my congressional district or your congressional district, but it belongs to everybody.

Mr. DINGELL. Then what about the disposable surpluses with regard to which the gentleman spoke just now, having to do with canned goods being given to the hungry?

Mr. MANASCO. I said if we open the floodgates for the school people, for the farm people and for other groups, then the thing that will hurt the farmer most is for us to give away canned goods and foods to the people who are hungry throughout the world. That is my argument against breaking down this orderly disposal of surplus property.

I want to pay my respects to the farmers of this country. Everybody else has been paying their respects to industry and labor for the magnificent job they have done in the war production. And they have done a magnificent job. But our farmers are producing 128 percent of the 1938 crop now. They are doing that without new machinery, whereas industry could come to Congress or to the operating agencies and get all the money and all the machines and equipment they needed to do their magnificent job. The farmer does have a little more claim than some other people to have some of these surpluses turned over to him at lower cost than to others, but with \$15,000,000,000 involved, with \$3,000,000,000 or \$4,000,000,000 of foodstuffs that can be thrown on the market when this war is over, a very serious problem is posed. We are already producing 28 percent more than we consumed in this country in 1938 and 1939. We must not lose sight of the fact that in the occupied countries we hope to restore to peace in the next few

months, those farmers are going to start producing and we are not going to have to feed those people as long as a lot of us were led to believe. Those foreign farmers do not want those surpluses dumped on their markets. This is an international problem as well as a local problem. In deciding this proposition of disposing of this surplus we have got to make up our minds whether or not we are going to permit our own local selfish interests to wreck an over-all orderly disposal.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has consumed 25 minutes.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we of necessity give the administrator almost absolute power. We decided that had to be done if we wanted an orderly disposal of this property. Congress cannot write a reversion bill that will cover every question that may arise. If we did we could not realize anything out of this surplus and we might destroy the very economy we hope to restore when the war is over.

Our committee reviewed many suggestions. The question of a board instead of an administrator was one of them. As a matter of fact I believe I introduced in Congress the first bill providing for a board composed of Government representatives, industry, labor, and the public, and also providing for industrial advisory boards. That bill was H. R. 2498, introduced on April 15, 1943, not 1944. A lot of people who are today favoring a board then thought that the best way to handle this would be through an administrator—one man who would be responsible to the Congress, one man who would not be as easily persuaded by the different pressure groups maybe as representatives on a board. That of course is a question for the Congress to decide. We gave the administrator almost unlimited power in the disposition of these surpluses. We must rely on his ability, honesty, integrity, and far-sightedness.

Mr. Clayton appeared before our committee. If you will look in the hearings at page 50 you will find the regulation he issued relative to the disposal of the surpluses. I believe none of us can find fault with the manner in which Mr. Clayton has acted. We can, of course, find fault with some minor items, but I believe the broad manner in which he has handled these surpluses has been very good.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I wish at this point in all honesty to say that I do criticize the handing over of a large acreage of agricultural farm land to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for disposition. It does seem to me that that land should have been used in the program of reducing farm tenancy and it should have been put into the farm-tenant purchase program with preference to veterans. That is one thing that was done that I cannot help but criticize.

Mr. MANASCO. I may say to the gentleman from California that that is not provided by this bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No; of course not.

Mr. MANASCO. He is doing that under his broad authority. That, of course, is subject to criticism by some of us. Others would criticize his turning it over to the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not a fact that the Executive order establishing this office provided that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation should be one of three Federal agencies to be used? So if there be any responsibility with respect to the disposition of this land it is rather under the Executive order than the policy of the Administrator.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I say I was not questioning Mr. Clayton's power to do what he did do; I admit he had the power to do it, but I do not happen to think he should have been able to do that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If I may make one more statement, Mr. Chairman, in view of that, when the President issued the Executive order he was justified, in my judgment, in undertaking to ascertain what agency of the Government could properly dispose of land, farm lands, and do so more successfully than any other agency. That was the Reconstruction Finance Corporation operating ever since the days of Herbert Hoover. It has been making loans, and my information is that they have disposed of and handled satisfactorily something like two and one-half or three million acres of land, something no other agency of the Government has done. So if we are to profit by the experience of the past, probably no agency in the Government could have handled this to better advantage, particularly in an effort to promote family-sized farms.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. One more observation, if the gentlemen will yield: I inquired of the R. F. C. and was told that they would have to put on a brand new set of people to handle this whole business if the land was to be disposed of in family size units.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And, Mr. Chairman, in that connection, I understood they had the machinery already available. That was the testimony before our committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, one of the big problems to face solution by the Administrator will be the disposition of our war plants. Many of you do not have war plants in your communities. At this point in the RECORD I am going to insert a table showing that the Federal Government has expended over \$15,000,000,000 in the construction of war plants.

(The table referred to follows:)

TABLE III.—War industrial facilities financed with public and private funds
[In thousands of dollars]

Type of product	Estimated cost		
	Public	Private	Total
MANUFACTURING AND MINING FACILITIES			
Ordnance:			
Explosives, ammunition assembling, and loading.....	2,848,346	20,651	2,868,997
Ammunition, shells, bombs, etc.....	1,093,138	141,015	1,234,153
Guns and combat vehicles.....	1,225,370	214,796	1,440,166
Total.....	5,166,854	376,462	5,543,316
Aircraft—engines, parts, accessories.....	3,113,768	282,089	3,395,857
Ship construction and repair.....	2,128,465	172,932	2,301,397
Iron and steel and its products.....	1,068,866	881,097	1,949,963
Nonferrous metals and their products, total.....	1,167,568	362,797	1,530,365
Machine tools and other metal-working equipment.....	139,144	159,097	298,241
Machinery and electrical equipment and appliances.....	485,846	290,200	776,046
Chemicals (including synthetic rubber).....	1,188,579	412,613	1,601,192
Products of petroleum and coal.....	211,465	595,641	807,106
Miscellaneous manufacturing.....	239,112	353,919	593,031
Mining of metal ores and minerals.....	147,424	176,177	323,601
Total.....	15,057,091	4,063,024	19,120,115
INDUSTRIAL SERVICE FACILITIES			
Gas, light, heat, and power.....	472,767	794,655	1,267,422
Transportation.....	191,309	1,188,885	1,380,194
Communication.....	3,975	131,320	135,295
Total.....	668,051	2,114,860	2,782,911
Grand total.....	15,725,142	6,177,884	21,903,026

War procurement, July 1, 1940–June 30, 1944
[In billions of dollars]

Supplies:	
Aircraft:	
Combat aircraft.....	89
Transports.....	2
Ships:	
Combat vessels.....	23
Merchant shipping.....	9
Guns and ammunition.....	21
Trucks.....	5
Clothing and equipage.....	7
Food.....	7
Other munitions and supplies.....	21
Total.....	134
War construction:	
Military installations.....	17.5
Industrial plant and facilities.....	15.5
Total.....	33
Total, actual and scheduled.....	167

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. Does the committee have any information with reference to the number of these plants that might continue in operation at reduced production?

Mr. MANASCO. That is a question that I do not believe anyone at this time can answer. As I started to say, many

of you have war plants in your districts, many of you have powder plants, chemical plants, synthetic-rubber plants, high-octane gasoline plants, aircraft factories, and so forth. There are, of course, some people who want the Federal Government to continue to operate these plants, but I believe the large majority of the membership of this House wants these plants operated by private enterprise as far as possible. I do not believe our Government wants to go into the manufacture of airplanes. We own one aircraft factory that will be able to make all the planes needed in this country after the war is over. So the taxpayers are not going to destroy our private aircraft industry by operating that plant in order to give employment to people in that district.

We must let the Administrator dispose of these plants. If you leave it up to Congress to do it, you will have another Muscle Shoals. All of you will remember that the nitrate plant at Muscle Shoals stood idle for 15 years until it was taken over by the T. V. A. Fortunately, I do not have any war plants in my district. It is fortunate for our people, I think, because they will never have the terrible shock when war contracts are canceled that people in a lot of the districts will have. If Congress itself has the veto power over the sale of these war plants, then if one is sold in your district, your opponent who runs against you in the next election is going to accuse you of getting a cut out of it. If the plant stands idle, your opponent is going to say that some big industrialist paid you to see that the plant is not used. So the best thing for us to do is to give the Administrator the authority to sell all these war plants.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. On the gentleman's premise, as suggested by him, why did the committee include in the bill restrictions as to two kinds of plants—synthetic and aluminum? If the provisions included in the bill in regard to the synthetic and aluminum plants are valid, important, and desirable, why would not those same provisions be equally desirable with regard to some other thing?

Mr. MANASCO. Personally I opposed the inclusion of section 13 in the bill, but the committee saw fit to keep it in there for this reason, and I think I can state the reason. Synthetic rubber is a new industry in our country. It is not a local industry, or an industry affected by purely local conditions. It will affect even our international relations.

Some of our friends appeared before the committee. I believe the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] appeared before the committee and objected to these plants being turned over to monopolies. We all know that up to the time of the war the aluminum industry was almost a monopoly. It was the desire that Congress express itself.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I say to the gentleman I agree with what the committee did in that case, but I maintain that they should have put chemicals in there, they should have put petroleum products in there, and they should have included steel.

Mr. MANASCO. And aircraft factories and magnesium plants. If you are going to put one in, you have to put them all in and when the war is over you would not be able to get the Congress to dispose of any of them. You would have a very embarrassing situation in this country.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If I understand this bill correctly, the administrator first makes a report to Congress with respect to synthetic plants and aluminum plants?

Mr. MANASCO. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And after having made that report and after Congress acts on the report, then he may dispose of those particular types of property?

Mr. MANASCO. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And not before?

Mr. MANASCO. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the committee was very wise in making that provision. The objection I had to the bill that came before our committee, the Banking and Currency Committee, and I do not believe that has been mentioned here, was that the bill provided that the administrator might dispose of all these plants. I raised a question on synthetic rubber and stated I would not go along with the bill if the administrator was given absolute carte blanche authority to dispose of the great synthetic industry in this country, which is as wide as our international relations. I congratulate the committee on making at least that restriction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, may I say in reply to the gentleman from Michigan that I do not think you will ever find a buyer for the present synthetic rubber plants because the American people are not going to buy \$22 tires and get a low mileage at only 35 miles an hour when they can buy good raw rubber tires for \$14, run 80 miles an hour on them, and get a very high mileage.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not assume the gentleman means for the Record to show that that is the history of synthetic rubber tires?

Mr. MANASCO. It is almost the history.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I happen to be connected with a company that has used hundreds of tons of rubber on wheels, if you please. The synthetic rubber tires are giving first-class service.

Mr. MANASCO. I have not had that experience. Mine may have been a little sad.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I think it goes without saying that in certain fields and for certain purposes synthetic rubber is superior to the natural rubber.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; and we know up in Michigan what happens.

Mr. DINGELL. Yes; we know, too, that synthetic rubber will survive for certain purposes regardless of cost.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think so.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, a question was asked as to why the Colmer bill was stricken and the substitute offered. I may answer that by saying that the committee made a few amendments that were suggested by the legislative counsel and by Mr. Clayton and his counsel which clarified and made the bill more mechanically perfect. We did not want to come in on the floor of the House with a bill having a few "and's" and "the's" all through it in italics, so, we thought we would rewrite it and prevent the committee becoming confused when the Members read the whole bill. There is no major change in policy from the bill recommended by Mr. Clayton and the bill introduced by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER]. This bill has been agreed to by the operating agencies and the departments.

I have taken more time from other members of the committee than I intended to.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. May I make a statement which the distinguished gentleman from Alabama perhaps is too modest to make. In addition to the gentleman's service on this particular committee, he has rendered an outstanding service as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds investigating this matter of the disposition of surplus property. I want to commend the gentleman for the industry and the intelligence that he has shown in connection with his study of this question.

Mr. MANASCO. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I greatly regret that those who want to speak on this bill on this side do not seem to be available at the moment, but I cannot let this side remain unrepresented. We cannot let you take all the time over there. I made a few remarks on the rule but only general remarks relating to the advisability and necessity for the bill. It is supposed to be limited to 3 years. My experience with these bureaus is that the nearest thing to immortality is a Government bureau. Yet, we are setting up another new one. As a matter of fact, it is already set up by Executive order. This is really the Clayton bill. He wrote it or practically wrote it with the agreement and approval of other departments. Of course, the various departments could

hardly be expected to express disagreement.

There is not as much opposition expressed in these hearings as you might think there would be. There will be some amendments offered. I once heard it said "some love the meat; some love to pick the bone." There will be a few bones here for you to pick. There are some who must awaken themselves to the fact that it must be amended to take care of certain conditions that exist in their particular localities. I note the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] has a pleasing smile of amusement or approval. There is to be disposal of large plants and the disposal of much land for agricultural purposes. I have been in the real-estate business for many years. Much of this work will have to do with the disposal of lands and property and the giving of proper title. We attempt by this bill not to pass a law but to express a warning that they shall be fair about disposal of this property and that the former owner shall have first chance to get it back. That bothers me a bit.

Has not the Government paid the former owner a just price for what it has taken? The Government is supposed to do that. Shall a former owner have any more of a vested right in getting back something that he has been paid for than you or I? More than that, has he the right under this language that we have here to contest the title to the property if disposed of not exactly as suggested in the bill? As I said in the committee this morning, I have lying on my desk a notice whereby certain property has been taken. I did not know I owned any land there. Shall I afterward put in a claim on a piece of land I did not know about particularly, but being a former owner shall I have the privilege of putting in a claim and holding up the sale of the tract?

We really say here that the administrator as far as he can shall be prejudiced in favor of restoring the property to the former owner. Certainly he should have that right if the former owner has not reestablished himself and conditions are such that it could reasonably be restored to him and the Government properly reimbursed.

There is a great deal of land involved in various sections of the country. They have taken much of it by lease; they have taken much of it by eminent domain and much of the land is now unfit for that for which it was formerly used. I want to warn you that when we reach that point in the bill that we will have some discussion as to returning this agricultural land as well as some other land.

The bill requires that they shall make a report to Congress every 3 months or 6 months and tell you why and how they disposed of real estate. They can lease these large plants for 5 years. What advantage is that man going to have? Shall we fix it so that the wartime plants shall be made permanent at the expense of other permanent establishments of business?

Looking over the bill, as I stated before, it is not so difficult. This will no

longer be an executive agency. It should be called the Clayton bill, enacted into law, approved by Congress. The objectives are easily understood: To facilitate and regulate the orderly disposal of surplus goods. Like the Atlantic Charter, it means well.

It says here "such property for the purposes of war and national defense." Of course, that is right. Next it says, "to facilitate the transition of enterprises from wartime to peacetime production and of individuals from wartime to peacetime employment."

Will it do it? We hope so. Continuing it says, "to promote production, employment of labor, and utilization of the productive capacity and the natural and agricultural resources of the country." Does that sound all right to you? Really it sounds all right to me. That is what we want to do. But there is a question as to just how to do it when you read the bill. Then it says, "to avoid dislocations of the domestic economy and of international economic relations." You see, we have an international problem here. How are we to dispose of that property over there? There will be quantities of it. It says here that surplus property at home and elsewhere shall be disposed of under rules and regulations. Will Lend-Lease or the Foreign Economic Division take it over?

We do not want it sold for practically nothing and have it reshipped here and sold in competition with our goods. We do not want that. We want to sell it to them over there at a fair price. I do not know, but does the O. P. A. have anything to do with what they sell things for over there? Over here, you know, we have to dispose of it at a price that the O. P. A. feels we have to get. The O. P. A. is to come into the picture, but probably not over there in the foreign country. These nations have no money with which to pay for it. Shall we leave all those ammunition shells that cost \$600 each and all other munitions over there or shall we bring it back to this country? Is it junk? It has the potential value of defense, and over there it may have a greater potential value than it has over here. But some advocate that it must not be reshipped back here.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. I was just thinking, if we leave the shells and the ammunition over there now it would simply save transporting it back the next time they ask us to come over there to fight another war for them.

Mr. GIFFORD. That is a comforting suggestion. There is little doubt but that they will be our allies again. But when you ask me a question as to the results of this bill, you know it is very broad in its grants of authority. The administrator is to be practically a dictator. This bill contains but little law. It is a statement of policies that we hope will be followed. The administrator might go on a vacation and his deputies delegated with his powers. In a sense

we are really setting up here a dictator, and it may be preferable to a so-called board. The more corrupt the state, the more laws we need. Did not things happen after the last war that were corrupt? We are hoping that this bill will point the way to avoid a repetition.

No matter how carefully we frame these statements of policies, or even actual cases, I want this to sink in. "No written law or statement can be so plain but which ill will and malice may obscure." If disposal is not always made along the lines of this bill, some reason can always be presented why it was not done. Some of us will be importuned by our people to see to it that the administrator does not do things that he clearly should have done, because it may be inimical to the interest of our own particular section. You will have some amendments presented along that line, and I hope you will see what I have in mind.

My predecessor who just took his seat said something about fifteen million. Did the gentleman not mean fifteen billion? The gentleman said fifteen million several times.

Mr. MANASCO. Fifteen million? I meant fifteen billion.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes. But nobody corrected him. What is the matter with this House today? Are you taking everything without questioning it? I have read that we will have \$103,000,000 of surplus goods. I do not know what the gentleman means by that fifteen billion. Does that mean 15,000,000,000 of peanuts or things of that nature?

We will have enormous quantities of war munitions which will be of no good unless for war purposes. It is not even good for scrap, because it is not worth making scrap of it. Shall we throw it overboard? This bill says that we shall dispose of it. But if we find it is not worth while what can they do? It says here they can give it away. They can destroy it or otherwise. I do not know what that "otherwise" means. It says here that we shall dispose of it, that which we cannot find a market for, to charitable and educational institutions. Your charitable and educational institutions will importune you often that you will see to it that that college or school gets that material that will not sell readily. You are to be importuned about many things, because this bill says that the State and the municipal organizations as well as educational and charitable institutions shall be considered. Already there is surplus property worth quite a lot of money. Your city might want it for rehabilitation or recreational centers. If the Government has no use for it, the city will want it. The State or the county or the town will demand that they shall pay nothing or have a very favorably rate. If you do not recall this custom, read the private bills that have been presented on such matters.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. May I ask the gentleman for information? I note on

page 29 this language. Section (1) of subsection (b) "any property which is damaged or worn beyond economical repair"; and "(2) any waste, salvage, scrap, or other similar items."

May I ask how that question will be decided? Is that completely within the jurisdiction of the administrator or some of his assistants? The reason I ask that question is that the disposal of this great amount of machine tools that we read about some time ago has a scrap value, although the machine tools were in perfect shape. Is there any provision in this bill for the protection of the Government on the disposal of materials which might be described as scrap but which might be good?

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman will note that in subsection (b) it states that any owning agency may dispose of any property which is damaged or worn beyond economical repair, subject to subsection (c), which reads:

Whenever he deems such action necessary to effectuate the objectives and policies of this act, the Administrator, by regulations, shall restrict the authority of any owning agency to dispose of any class of surplus property under subsection (b) of this section.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I think the gentleman's question may be answered by referring to page 25, item (g), which provides that—

The term "care and handling" includes repairing, converting, rehabilitating, operating, maintaining, preserving, protecting, storing, packing, handling, and transporting.

I wanted to call that to the attention of the gentleman from California.

In the gentleman's brief discussion of the rule he mentioned something about how this will affect our constituents. What did he mean by that?

Mr. GIFFORD. I meant that there may have been an enormous plant put in the gentleman's community because nearby was the raw material, and they have brought a lot of people from various parts of the country, housing them in temporary housing.

Mr. STEFAN. I have such a case in my district.

Mr. GIFFORD. Almost everyone of us has such cases. How can you write into the law any definition covering that?

Mr. STEFAN. How would this bill affect your constituents? Is there any protection to your constituency or your locality in the bill, as the gentleman reads it?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; it provides that the Administrator shall use good judgment.

Mr. STEFAN. We have a war plant in my district. We also have a satellite airport. The satellite airport has been abandoned. They are now leasing the land for the production of food, but the airport will not be used.

Mr. GIFFORD. Can they not see to it that the former owners get it back and make it profitable, or do not the former owners want it?

Mr. STEFAN. Yes; the former owners would like to have it, of course. In many cases the former owners have told me that they would be willing to buy that land back.

Mr. GIFFORD. In this bill about the best thing they can do is to put in language stating purposes and desires, but they leave it to a dictator or administrator with full, complete power.

Mr. STEFAN. It is absolutely necessary to put something in here that the people can understand. We are disposing of surplus property in this country right now. People are suspicious that perhaps that will get into the hands of a favored few.

Mr. GIFFORD. Does the gentleman realize that we are putting everything into the hands of the administrator, although there is one clause in the bill that the Maritime Commission shall retain control of maritime property? We cannot do anything about that. There is also a hint at a limitation of power on the part of the administrator here and there, and there is to be an advisory board. There will be a lot of back scratching between agencies, will there not?

Mr. STEFAN. That is right, but the serious problem right now is that the Treasury Procurement Division is disposing of considerable surplus material now, and the people in my district—and I have just come back from my district—are very suspicious that perhaps some favored few are getting this surplus material. They are looking to Congress to do something to see to it that it does not get into the hands of the monopolies or the favored few. I think something ought to be done, and I agree with the gentleman that we ought to write something into this bill to take care of that.

Mr. GIFFORD. There should be no room for favoritism in our form of government, but if you get something for constituents of yours, they will claim that you received special favors.

Mr. STEFAN. In the gentleman's speech this morning he indicated that this law might create thieves and robbers. What did the gentleman mean by that?

Mr. GIFFORD. I meant that in order to get around laws they might be considered thieves and robbers. The more laws you make the more rascals you make. Naturally some will not obey. The more laws, the more to be circumvented. I find a great feeling growing in this Nation of ours that this is a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, and if what you do and what I do does not please, the people hesitate to comply.

Mr. STEFAN. Our people at home are suspicious; they are worried about this thing. They want us to write some laws here to see that this property does not get into the hands of the robbers and thieves. Certainly we are intelligent enough to do that.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want a law under which an aggrieved party can complain

and receive justice and relief. I do not want a bureau set up giving the administrator absolute power with no redress for the aggrieved party. There is that eternal enmity between the law and the dictator. This is a warning, not a criticism. This bill is not much law; it is expressing a hope that certain policies be carried out. There are some directions in it.

Mr. STEFAN. Would the gentleman rather have a board than an administrator?

Mr. GIFFORD. Who appoints the board? Think of what we have had in the last 10 years. I hate to criticize, for the Democrats are my friends, but why did you put in so many men of the type you did to run this country? Why did you do it?

You new Members may not remember, but from 1934 to 1938 I was busy on the floor as a member of the Expenditures Committee. I know how suspiciously you looked at me, but I could name several administrators that I think you would agree with me were rather unfit to be the head of several highly important agencies. You are sorry about it but you do not do anything to change it. We are soon to do something to change that, I hope. Then I will answer the question.

Do I like a board? Yes; if they limit it to good and able men. Under this bill there will probably be at least 12 regional agencies set up over the country, such as we have representing other bureaus. You go tell your story to these agencies, but they can do nothing until they hear from Washington. There will be a tremendous number of appointments, a man for this and that special thing but with little power to act without approval from Washington. My people look me in the eye and say, "You have to see the right people," when I failed in getting attention. One constituent said to me, "Must I appeal to Washington to an old-line Democrat? Cannot you do anything?" It is not as bad as that. I am saying that is the way he looked at it. I am not complaining. I have been more or less successful, because even though I talk forcibly at times, I really try to be a gentleman. I think over my approach to these agencies very carefully.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it possible under this bill for the administrator to establish a Government store in every community in the United States to sell food, clothing, hardware, jeeps, and everything else, in competition with taxpayers who are in that business?

Mr. GIFFORD. I should not think so, but it might amount to that. We are trying in this bill to put this property in the hands of the regular dealers at a fair price.

Mr. CURTIS. Should there not be a provision in this bill forbidding them to establish retail stores?

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman will find in the hearings that they asked the question, Who is a dealer? Take the case of a man who would buy a jeep, and

although he had made a trade-in only once during his life, during the last few years, he might be considered a dealer?

Mr. CURTIS. How do you know that the individuals answering the questions are going to be the individuals making the over-all policy?

Mr. GIFFORD. We have to run that risk.

Mr. CURTIS. Why can there not be a provision in here prohibiting the establishment of Government retail stores to sell surplus property?

Mr. GIFFORD. If we did that, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] will tell you, there would be no end of the definitions, because it is such an enormous problem. The only way you can possibly do it is to outline general suggestions and general conditions, but you cannot define it too closely on any particular activity.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to answer that question?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. In section 2, item C, on page 24, you will find that the agency can dispose of one or more classes of surplus property. I believe under that section they can set up a retail store.

Mr. CURTIS. I think they could. I have read the bill. I think they could.

With reference to this advisory board to the administrator, who on that board represents the taxpayers?

Mr. GIFFORD. Who on that board represents the taxpayers?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. "Represents the taxpayers?" Do I hear aright?

Mr. CURTIS. It seems to me they are all representatives of the Government.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes. Yes; I really would not want to try to answer.

Mr. CURTIS. Is there anybody on that board who represents the retail and wholesale trades?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Why, these are all agencies of the Government. But they are Cabinet officers and they can delegate authority, and name some one to act for them in all these cases. They will probably delegate it. They can do most anything under this bill. I started out to comment on the various provisions of the bill and you immediately stopped me by inquiring whether I wanted a board instead of one man. I tried to answer that by saying if I knew proper persons would be selected I would feel confident. It is bad enough to take a risk on one, but if we have to take a risk on seven or more, I am not ready to answer. I have commented on various provisions of the bill that are to be bones of contention later, hoping that I could draw your attention to them early in the debate.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DEWEY. In following out the inquiry of the gentleman from Nebraska,

[Mr. CURTIS], there seems to be a little hiatus or loophole or whatever one might call it, between the regulation of the Administrator preventing him to deal with the individual and what departments of Government who claim certain articles belong to them may do. Because on page 29, section 7, there is found this language:

subject only to the regulations of the Administrator with respect to price policies, any owning agency may dispose of any property for the purpose of war production or authorize any contractor with such agency.

And so on.

Mr. GIFFORD. It says "for the purpose of war production." The gentleman will note that.

Mr. DEWEY. But the section reads further:

Subsection (b). Subject to subsection (c) of this section any owning agency may dispose of (1) any property which is damaged or worn beyond economical repair; (2) any waste, salvage, scrap, or other similar item.

It has been called to my attention that one agency, I think it is the Quartermaster General's office, is selling Army shoes for 14 cents a pair which have been slightly worn, not worn where they might have, for example, a large hole through them, but worn because they did not fit the soldier to whom they were issued, so he discarded them and got a better-fitting pair of shoes. That pair of shoes thus has become used property and is sold for 14 cents, and they might go into these outlet stores such as the gentleman referred to. I do think there ought to be inserted here some item preventing outlet stores that are going to come into competition with men trying to make new shoes and make new jobs.

Mr. GIFFORD. We have already taken that up and it says in subsection (c), if the gentleman will read further, if that kind of business goes on the administrator can restrict them.

Mr. DEWEY. They can be restricted under the bill?

Mr. GIFFORD. I have seen awful waste, and so has the gentleman. There is so much red tape in keeping books and keeping track of things, that when an outfit in the Army leaves suddenly, what happens? Yes, they burn it, they dispose of it in many ways rather than trouble to account for it otherwise. This bill is not new to me. This plan is not new to me. We have had it before, almost a year ago, where the Bureau of the Budget wanted to control this surplus property through the procurement agencies. At that time we had much discussion of it, but the plants and the lands and that sort of thing were too big a problem of solution at that time. We decided to deal only with surplus supplies.

Mr. CURTIS. One more question, following the line of thought of the gentleman from Illinois, and to be specific, who, for instance, does the gentleman suppose will sell surplus shoes belonging to the United States Government? Will the Government retail them or will the retail shoe dealers of the United States retail them?

Mr. GIFFORD. We have said here that they shall sell to the dealers that are in the business at a fair price. But if they sell to those dealers, the dealers will not have to order new goods, will they? Will that add to unemployment?

Mr. CURTIS. But a Government agency already owning these shoes can go ahead and sell them under the old rules without turning them over to a disposing agency. Is that not right?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I might take more time if it were available. There is a good deal more to be said, but I must keep this in mind, "It is an immense advantage never to have said anything."

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, it is doubtful that I will use the entire 30 minutes, but there are just one or two phases of this bill to which I wish to direct the attention of the committee. My distinguished colleague who preceded me raised the issue in the beginning of his remarks of the provisions of this bill as to the disposal of surplus agricultural lands. Since that has been the phase of the bill in which I have been most interested and to which I have given most attention, I want to discuss it briefly. In the course of writing this bill, the committee upon my insistence wrote into the mandatory provisions of the bill subsection (g) of section 15 on page 39, this amendment:

In disposing of surplus agricultural lands in the United States, former owners shall be given a reasonable time to be fixed by the administrator in which to repurchase their original tracts, at a price not exceeding that paid them by the Government, except where the value of such tract has been increased by the Government. Except for above provisions, such land shall be sold when practicable, in family-size parcels, not more than one such parcel being sold to any one family or individual, and such sale being made insofar as possible to persons who expect to live upon and cultivate such land. This subsection shall apply only to land acquired after July 1, 1940.

That provision was written in without collaboration with the various agencies of the Government and without the advice and consent of the general counsel to the administrator in charge of surplus properties, and is opposed by most of the executive departments. Upon reconsideration of this amendment which I favor, personally, in the interest of harmony and in an abundance of precaution and in order not to impose upon the surplus property administrator an impossible administrative job, the committee has redrawn that particular amendment and when the bill is being read for amendment we will offer, in lieu of this subsection (g), above read, the following amendment; and we are going to suggest that the amendment be placed not in the mandatory provisions of the bill, but in section 11, which is a declaration of policy and purposes, which will not in such event, embarrass or impose upon the administrator any impossible job.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 34, line 3, insert a new subsection to read as follows:

"(g) To dispose of land in the United States, acquired after June 30, 1940, by the United States, which the administrator deems suitable for agricultural use:

"(1) By affording to the person or persons from whom such land was acquired by the United States a reasonable opportunity to reacquire such land at a price not greater than that for which it was so acquired by the United States, such acquisition price being properly adjusted to reflect any increase or decrease in the value of such land resulting from action by the United States; and

"(2) If not disposed of as provided in paragraph (1), and if the administrator deems that the land should be disposed of for agricultural uses, in parcels not larger than suitable for the needs of one family unit; not more than one parcel to a family unit, and only for use as agricultural land and home by such family unit."

Now, briefly what we are concerned with primarily is these Army camps that went into farming communities and dispossessed hundreds of farmers—if and when the Government has finished with such camps and this land is placed on the market, it ought to be returned to family-size farms such as were on those particular tracts at the time the Government acquired them.

In the second place we are very much concerned that this land be kept out of the hands of speculators. In fact, in this whole matter of disposition of surplus war property, we are all concerned that nobody should make any unusual or excessive profits out of the handling of these properties, and that principle and policy is so stated in the bill.

There are between five and seven million acres of agricultural lands that have been taken over by the Government, incident to the war program. These particular camps have tremendous economic importance in the communities in which they are situated. If some provision for the orderly disposition of these lands is not followed, then land speculators will come along and buy up entire tracts, to the detriment of all concerned except the speculator.

There was some argument in the committee, and the question may be raised in this debate, whether or not the former owner ought to have the right to reacquire this land at a price not exceeding that paid to him. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that in 99 cases out of 100 these farmers whose lands were taken for Army camps did not want to sell. Many of them made voluntary conveyance because they felt it was their patriotic duty to do so. Others, because they knew the land would be acquired by condemnation. But from one form of compulsion or another, they gave up their land and they went to the city or to some defense plant and got a job.

To make this a little clearer, in one county in my district, some 60,000 acres of the best farm land in the county was taken over for an Army camp. Hundreds of farmers were dispossessed. Some of them got more than the land was worth, others less. Some of them have been satisfied with the price they received,

but many of them felt they were cheated. They felt the land was worth a great deal more than the Government paid for it. Some of them refused to sell, and many of those cases are still in court. I say that this owner of agricultural land whose property was taken through one form of compulsion or another, ought to have a reasonable time, 30 days, 60 days, 90 days, or 6 months or some other period, but some reasonable time within which he can reacquire that property at a price not exceeding that paid him by the Government.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Suppose oil has been found on this land as was mentioned in connection with the one particular case, what would the provision of the bill be in that instance?

Mr. GOSSETT. Let me call attention to section 11, in which we propose to incorporate this new amendment—the amendment in the policies section. Section 11 is the section of the bill which reads:

In formulating regulations to govern the care and handling and disposition of surplus property under this act, the Administrator shall be guided by the objectives stated in section 1 of this act, and shall give effect as to the following policies to the extent feasible, and in the public interest.

I am not sure what the administrator's attitude would be in that matter, but here is my attitude: I say that if anybody is going to make any money, speculative or otherwise, out of this land that has been forcibly taken away from the owner, it ought to be the owner. I feel that the owner ought to be given a reasonable time within which to reacquire that property, at a price not exceeding that paid him by the Government, regardless of how many oil fields may have been discovered in the meantime. Somebody is going to make some unearned increment, we will say, from the oil value of this land. Who is more entitled to that than the original owner? In nine cases out of ten the original owner wanted to keep the mineral rights under these lands. The particular camp I have in mind is in oil country. There are wells on all sides of it. These men wanted to retain the mineral rights but the Government would not agree to it. Meantime, the property may have increased substantially in value because of the possibilities of the discovery of oil. If the owner does not get that increased benefit, then somebody else will get it. Why should the Government be penurious, why should the Government deal harshly with a citizen whose property it has acquired?

There will be some isolated cases such as this field you have in mind, where some exorbitant profits will inure to the man whose property was taken. But, he would have been in possession of that land but for the Government coming in and taking over the land. So I say the Government ought to let him take it back at a price not exceeding that which they paid him.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. LEMKE. I understand you have transferred this section from mandatory to a simple question of policy. With the experience we have had with so many of the Government agencies, does not the gentleman think that will be just lip service to fool the public? Why can it not be mandatory?

Mr. GOSSETT. I preferred the mandatory provision and so contended, but in the interest of harmony and trying to get something worked out that we could pass through the Congress, I agreed to go along on the statement of policy.

Mr. LEMKE. May I suggest, are you not taking a great chance of simply having words enacted and wasting our time and not gaining anything in the end?

Mr. GOSSETT. No. I hardly think so. I intend to see that that policy is enforced in my district if it is written into this bill, and I assume other gentlemen will do likewise.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. On the question of policy, on page 34, paragraph I, the bill reads:

To prevent insofar as possible unusual and excessive profits being made out of surplus property.

What do you have in the bill to put teeth into that? You are simply writing a beautiful platitude there, but what is there in the bill to nail that down so that there will not be any excessive profits made?

Mr. GOSSETT. I might say that I personally offered that amendment to that subsection, knowing at the time that it was merely a statement of principle and high purpose and if you can figure out some way to nail it down I will go along with you. I thought this statement of principle and policy against profiteering was better than no such statement and would be helpful as a sort of mandate to the administrator.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Could we not say that no person shall make beyond a certain percentage?

Mr. GOSSETT. That might work in one class of property and would not work on another. Some property might be very speculative. You try to work that out, and if you can I will be glad to help write it into this bill.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Speaking to the question propounded by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] with reference to the probable development of oil property in isolated cases like the one in Oklahoma, would not the Administrator have authority and jurisdiction to control such matter in that it might not be feasible, perhaps?

We remember very well the fact that part of the former owners of this property really never owned it or had not lived on it or had not shown any interest in it until the oil property was developed. In cases like that would not the Administrator have authority and jurisdiction to handle it and adjust it by regulation?

Mr. GOSSETT. I think he would, under these proposed regulations.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. One other point. With reference to the disposition of agricultural real estate, giving the former owners first opportunity to reacquire the property, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas and the committee for the fine work they have done in this bill, particularly in giving former owners the authority to reacquire this property. The gentleman indicated there would be a proviso in the amendment that he will propose, that the disposition should be made only of family-size parcels of land.

Mr. GOSSETT. Let me clear the gentleman up on that. That does not apply to the acquisition by former owners. The provision as to former owners is covered in paragraph 1. The disposition of family-size parcels is in paragraph 2. The family-sized parcel provision applies only to disposition of land to others aside from former owners. If you are a former owner and you sold 2,000 acres to the Government, you get that 2,000 acres back. It makes no difference the size of the tract taken from you or sold by you as an original owner, you get that back if you want it. But if you decline the option extended to you to reacquire that land then, insofar as possible, insofar as economic and desirable, the administrator may and if it is practicable shall divide that up into family-sized farming units.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. I have advocated such policy for some time. To be a little more specific, I have in my native county, in my district, Hempstead County, through which the gentleman travels when he goes back to Texas, the Southwestern Ordinance Project of some 54,000 acres. When that land was taken over by the Government there were families who owned as high as 4,000 or 5,000 acres. The land was taken by condemnation. Would the former owners under this bill have authority within a certain time to reacquire the entire 4,000 or 5,000 acres taken?

Mr. GOSSETT. Yes; absolutely. That is, provided, of course, it is agricultural land.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Yes; it is agricultural land of which I am speaking. One further question, if the gentleman will permit.

Mr. GOSSETT. Certainly.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. With reference to the disposal of real estate whereon there may be airports. What is the idea or the thinking of the committee in writing the bill with respect to the disposition of airports and their facilities when and if they are declared surplus property?

Mr. GOSSETT. That is covered by the general provisions of the bill and the directives and recommendations imposed upon the administrator in the disposal of property generally.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Will the municipalities in those localities have the opportunity to acquire them?

Mr. GOSSETT. If I were the administrator that would certainly be the

policy, and I assume it will be the policy of whoever administers this law.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Could the gentleman advise the House whether or not there was any discussion of payment on disposition of airport facilities and real estate which had been constructed?

Mr. GOSSETT. I notice that at some of the committee meetings they had discussed that but at the committee hearings I attended we did not discuss it specifically.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. I may state to the gentleman from Arkansas that considerable discussion was given to that subject and in the bill we left the disposal of airports specifically to the administrator because he had at the service of his advisory board the Civil Aeronautics Authority. The C. A. A. is making surveys to determine which airports will have military use and which of those not having military use may be used by municipalities. Under the recommendation of State aviation commissions and the Civil Aeronautics Authority they can be sold to the municipalities or leased to them. They will not of course be sold for a very high figure.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. If the gentleman from Texas will yield, that is just the point to which I wish to direct the question: Would it be possible for the municipalities perhaps under the jurisdiction of the C. A. A. to purchase that property?

Mr. MANASCO. They could lease it or purchase it.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. For instance, if there is a \$1,000,000 airport at some small city of ten, twelve, or fifteen thousand population it would not be practical or at least it would be almost impossible for a city of that size to purchase an airport of that type.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. MANASCO. I may say that we discussed that very matter with Mr. Clayton, the present surplus property administrator. He told us it would be their policy to dispose of them for reasonable value to these municipalities. That question has already been decided by his organization. For instance, a million-dollar airport at a town of that size might possibly be leased to the municipality for \$500 a year; but we would not want to find ourselves, if we got into another war, where the city of Eldorado or the city of Jasper could come in and sell back to the Government for a million dollars property they got on a \$500 lease or some small amount. We want that recapture provision in the bill.

Mr. GOSSETT. I may say to the gentleman from Arkansas I have every confidence that that problem will be worked out administratively to the entire satisfaction of the local communities. In many instances these airports were built by the C. A. A. under an arrangement and understanding that they should revert to the municipality at the time the

Army or the Navy, as the case might be, finished with them.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, to be a little more specific—and I am sure there are other projects throughout the Nation in a similar category as this one where the Government has 54,000 acres of agricultural property—there has been constructed there by the Army an airport costing about a million dollars. That is at Hope, Ark. Before that time the city had spent some \$15,000 or \$18,000 in the acquisition of property for the construction of an airport. When the Army completed its airport they condemned the property the city had acquired for the city's airport. The city cannot therefore construct an airport on property they acquired for that purpose. Is there authority under this bill for the War Department or the disposing agency through the administrator to permit the use of this airport by the municipality of the city of Hope?

Mr. GOSSETT. I would think so; my answer to that would be "Yes."

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. From a reading of that section of the bill which states the policies of the framers of the bill, and also of the House if it passes the bill, I am wondering if it is sufficiently specific with regard to a policy which would prevent the purchase of goods at a cheap price and dumping them on the market? Among other policies it is stated that one policy is to prevent the making of excessive profits. I am, of course, concerned about that, but I am more concerned about the fact that if these goods are dumped on the market at a very low price it will prevent the manufacturer of goods which will be in competition with them to manufacture such goods at a profit, and hence would prevent the re-employment in industrial sections of returning soldiers and other people who need employment. I am wondering if it would not be a good idea—I believe it was stated by one of the other speakers this afternoon—to include as one of the policies to be pursued the discouragement of the dumping of goods in the market in competition with industry in post-war times.

Mr. GOSSETT. I believe the gentleman will find that in the bill.

Mr. WRIGHT. I do not know where it is. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would point it out to me.

Mr. GOSSETT. I know it was repeatedly discussed in the committee, and the committee was assured by the Surplus Property Administrator that he would take precautions to avoid the very thing the gentleman fears.

Mr. WRIGHT. If I may interrupt the gentleman further, I know it is in the bill at various points by implication, but I believe the matter is so important that Congress ought not to be neglectful of its duties, as it would be if it did not specifically state it was very much concerned about disturbing our post-war industry by dumping cheaply purchased goods on

the market to compete with post-war industry.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As the gentleman from Texas has very correctly said, that matter is covered both by the objectives and by the declaration of policies. For instance, in the objectives, if that situation were permitted to obtain the administrator would be violating the provisions of this law in a way that would disrupt the economy of the country. In a further effort to prevent it, in the objectives we not only adopted the language in the bill which was originally submitted to us to provide for employment, but we put in an additional provision to give employment; and in the disposition of the property we hedged it further by saying that undue profits should be prohibited and that small business should be promoted. But when it came to writing a formula that would be applicable to every species of property imaginable through the entire civilian economy, after listening to many suggestions, and to every proposal submitted, the committee concluded that the wise thing to do would be to adopt the broader discretionary language that is included in the bill.

Mr. GOSSETT. I call the gentleman's attention to paragraph (c) under the heading "Objectives," on page 23, at the very beginning of the bill, reading as follows:

To promote production, employment of labor, and utilization of the productive capacity and the natural and agricultural resources of the country.

Then I call his attention to page 33, subsection (e).

It says:

(e) To afford smaller business concerns, farmers, and agricultural enterprises generally an opportunity to acquire surplus property on equal terms with larger competitors; to provide as far as practicable for uniform and wide public notice concerning surplus property available for disposition and for adequate time intervals between notice and disposition so that all interested persons shall have a fair opportunity to acquire; to utilize commercial channels of distribution to the extent consistent with efficient and economic distribution, and to discourage disposition to speculators; to collaborate with Smaller War Plants Corporation; and to employ other appropriate means to give effect to this subsection.

Mr. WRIGHT. May I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate the explanation made by him and also by the gentleman from Mississippi. Of course, I agree with the gentleman that the evil against which I am talking would be against the purposes of the bill. I feel that it could be made a little bit more specific, but even if the bill is adopted in its present form, the discussion we have had will show the world the general purposes and the policies of the committee in drafting the bill. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GOSSETT. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would like to comment on that subsection (e) on page 33. It seems to me that it might be more specific. I am thinking of the disposal of quantities of all types of canned goods and even farm and automotive machinery. If those surplus properties are disposed of in large lots, while it might be considered that they are offered on equal terms with large competitors, the very fact they are in large lots would prohibit the individual from buying a tractor, we will say, where they might be sold in lots of 10. The general language I know intends to circumvent that. Would it not be possible to write into it some language that would provide that where prices were set on large lots of material or equipment, priority shall be given individual purchasers on the unit price until they had exhausted their needs on a unit basis?

Mr. GOSSETT. I may point out to the gentleman in subsection (e) it is stated:

To utilize commercial channels of distribution to the extent consistent with efficient and economic distribution.

I may say that I am concerned about that myself because I know the farmers want all the available trucks and tractors and they need them badly. I am not giving the gentleman this as my view. The surplus administrator contends that if you permitted the individual farmers to go to the Procurement Division of the Treasury and buy a tractor or a truck, it would put the Government in the retail business in competition with private enterprise and it would impose upon them an impossible administrative task. He assures us that the small dealers will be given the right to buy in small lots, possibly one or two at a time, if they so wish, and that if a group of trucks is to be disposed of in your State or area, all the dealers in your State or area will be given notice. If they want the larger quantity broken down into smaller quantities that will be done to accommodate them. When you get to trying to figure out a fair rule to cover all situations you cannot write it into a bill. You have to write general policies, and leave much to administrative discretion.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In connection with that, may I call attention to section 10, subparagraph (c) which reads as follows:

(c) The Administrator, by regulations, shall prescribe such policies governing prices and other terms and conditions of dispositions under the authority of subsections (a) and (b) of this section, as he deems necessary to effectuate the objectives and policies of this act.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman has spent a great deal of time on this bill. I have read the bill through myself and I would like to ask him this question: Suppose the bill becomes law substantially as it is printed now, and an indi-

vidual makes inquiry that he wants to buy a jeep, for example. Can we with assurance tell him that the place to buy jeeps will be through the established automotive truck dealers and that he better get his order in there?

Mr. GOSSETT. No; I would not be willing to give the gentleman any advice on what he should tell his constituents. I have about 15 applications myself.

Mr. CURTIS. What would the gentleman tell his constituents?

Mr. GOSSETT. I would refer them at this time to the Procurement Division of the Treasury.

Mr. CURTIS. I mean under this bill. I want to know what the procedure is going to be under this law.

Mr. GOSSETT. I understand the policy is to handle those through existing trade channels and I would suggest he see his nearest automobile dealer.

Mr. CURTIS. That is the intent of the Congress, as far as this committee is concerned?

Mr. GOSSETT. I do not know.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is a member of the committee.

Mr. GOSSETT. I am a member of the committee, yes; but I am not saying this bill expresses my own views on all of these problems.

Mr. CURTIS. But it is the intent of the committee that a system of that kind be followed?

Mr. GOSSETT. Yes; as expressed in this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman will understand that if you undertake to put some other regulations in here, it might operate in favor of the established agencies and might prevent the Government from getting the price that it ought to obtain; so that under all the necessities of the case you have to give the Administrator some discretion if he is going to effectuate the policies of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. RIZLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman from Texas may have covered this particular matter I have in mind. I did not hear his full statement. In my district they have established two prison camps by which the War Department took the best agricultural land in the district in establishing those camps. One of these farms consists of about a section and a half of land that the farmer had been about 25 years modernizing and getting his farm where he wanted it. They came in, condemned the land and took it away from him. The Government has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on those prison camps. Some of the buildings are of a permanent nature. Others, of course, are not of a permanent character.

First, will the farmer who they dispossessed of the land through court proceedings be given a preference and right to repurchase that land?

Mr. GOSSETT. He will if that land is held to be agricultural land. He might if it were held otherwise. I assume that the Administrator will work out some way to deal with all situations.

Mr. RIZLEY. Assuming it is held to be agricultural land, what adjustment will be made about all these various and sundry permanent buildings that they have put on the land constructed of concrete and otherwise? The farmer, perhaps, could not go in and buy this land back at anything like the value it has now with all of these permanent improvements the Government has put on it.

Mr. GOSSETT. If it is declared to be surplus agricultural land, then those permanent improvements that might have been added will have to be appraised and added to the purchase price of the land.

Mr. RIZLEY. That is the point I am trying to make. As far as the land being in that category is concerned, there is no question about the land being agricultural. The land has never been used for anything else and cannot be used for anything else. The land is situated right out in the middle of the biggest wheat-producing section of the United States. But the Government has so enhanced the value of these properties that the farmers can never come in and purchase the land back again.

Mr. GOSSETT. The entire place is not covered with those buildings, is it?

Mr. RIZLEY. No. They might segregate part of it, of course.

Mr. GOSSETT. I assume that matter could be worked out administratively. Certainly your constituent is in a better position with the proposed language written in the bill than he would be if it were never written in the bill. This does not require the Government to put the land back in status quo.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. The surplus property administrator a few days ago issued regulations on the resale of surplus real estate, in which most of the items now being discussed are covered.

Mr. GOSSETT. Not surplus real estate. Surplus farm land.

Mr. PACE. That is right. Most of the items here discussed have been fully gone into in those regulations. It should be distinctly understood that the previous owner has a preference only when the terms are exactly even. If the gentleman from Oklahoma and I should make an identical bid, if he has been the previous owner he will get the preference.

Mr. GOSSETT. The gentleman is entirely in error.

Mr. PACE. That is the way the regulation reads.

Mr. GOSSETT. That is not the way this amendment is written into the bill.

Mr. PACE. I was wondering if the gentleman from Texas would not include in his extension of remarks today a copy of those regulations, in order that the House may clearly see what the attitude of the administrator is on this question

as the regulations have already been drawn?

Mr. GOSSETT. The regulations, I might say to the gentleman from Georgia, are reproduced in the hearings.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman, I think, is stating the matter correctly with reference to the regulations, but the gentleman from Texas has pointed out that the proposed amendments to this bill as reported would change those regulations.

Mr. PACE. In what respect?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In giving the owner the entire right to acquire the property, at not to exceed the price the Government paid for it.

Mr. GOSSETT. At a price not exceeding that paid by the Government.

Mr. PACE. Is that in this bill?

Mr. GOSSETT. That is in the bill.

Mr. PACE. Where is the language?

Mr. GOSSETT. It is in the amendment I explained to the House will be offered.

Mr. PACE. It is not in the bill, then?

Mr. GOSSETT. Yes; it is in the bill. In subsection (g) of section 15, on page 39, we have written it into the mandatory provisions of the bill; but, as a matter of compromise, have agreed to write it into the policy section of the bill rather than the mandatory section of the bill.

Mr. PACE. Exactly what does the committee mean when setting up the policy of the Congress and it declares two things? One of the policies and purposes of this legislation as declared in the opening page is to promote the agricultural resources of the country. What are you talking about there?

Mr. GOSSETT. I did not write that language and was not present when the bill was drawn. The gentleman's idea of what that means is probably just as good as mine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PACE. On page 33 you declare further the policy is to afford the veterans an opportunity to establish themselves as proprietors of agricultural enterprises. What are you talking about there?

Mr. GOSSETT. May I say that I did not draw this bill and I did not write that language, but I can give my idea of what it means. If the former owner—

Mr. PACE. No; this is the veteran now.

Mr. GOSSETT. If the former owner of this tract of land does not want it or refuses to accept it, then the next man in line of priority is the veteran, if he wants to buy this farm, and it would be the duty of the administrator to facilitate the veteran's purchase of the farm. As I understand the work in that office, they are formulating some regulation under which that would be possible.

Mr. PACE. You confine that to the farm. How about the tractor, the jeep, and the truck?

Mr. GOSSETT. The veteran should be given preference there.

Mr. PACE. Then it is purely a matter of preference?

Mr. GOSSETT. It is a matter of administration.

Mr. PACE. Is that going to meet with the inquiry of the gentleman from Oklahoma as to the former owner, where the veteran and the former owner might both want to purchase?

Mr. GOSSETT. The former owner has the preference insofar as agricultural lands go.

Mr. PACE. And the gentleman is committed to that as the intent?

Mr. GOSSETT. Yes. I think the former owner ought to have the right to get his property back subject of course to the conditions heretofore stated.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In that connection, the word "opportunity" is used with respect to the veteran and the word "preference" with the respect to the former owner?

Mr. GOSSETT. That is correct.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. I have had experience in this sort of thing. In regard to one of the war camps located in one county they promised, as far as they could, that they would reconvey these tracts of land to the people from whom they were taken. They expect some time to get them back at the price that they either received by conveyance or through condemnation. But have you not gone a long ways and almost destroyed that assurance by taking this language out of the mandatory provisions of this bill and simply setting it out as a hope or wish or a policy to be followed?

Mr. GOSSETT. I hope not.

Mr. FOLGER. Is that not the effect of it?

Mr. GOSSETT. I prefer to have these mandatory provisions in the bill. I agreed to go along on the matter just by way of compromise, and in order to be sure of some protection in the bill for a proper disposal of these agricultural lands.

Mr. FOLGER. The committee wants that amendment to appear in the policy and objectives section of the bill?

Mr. GOSSETT. That is right.

Mr. FOLGER. But as it appears now, in disposing of surplus agricultural land in the United States the former owners shall be given preference mandatorily.

Mr. GOSSETT. That is right.

Mr. FOLGER. Is there anything wrong with that?

Mr. GOSSETT. I do not see anything wrong with that; not a thing, and I prefer it as now written. Its present form is my amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas about his pro-

posed amendment. Looking at page 39, line 5, I find this language, "except where the value of such tract has been increased by the Government." This applies directly to the question of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. GOSSETT. Yes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Did the gentleman leave that particular clause out of his new amendment?

Mr. GOSSETT. The gentleman will find that matter taken care of in the suggested amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It was put right back in?

Mr. GOSSETT. Yes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With respect to the question asked by the gentleman from North Carolina in reference to subparagraph (g) on page 39, it might be well to keep in mind that numerous bills have been introduced to effectuate that purpose. There have been reports from time to time signed by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Interior and other agencies of the Government, the net result of which asserted—and that was stated also by the administrator—that such a provision as this subsection (g) here would be difficult of administration and might prevent the disposal of all surplus lands, and would certainly delay it, to the detriment of the Government. For instance, there are about 70,000 tracts. There might be several hundred parcels at Willow Run, and you could not dispose of that plant unless you obtained, first, the consent of the man that had a quarter of an acre of land or a lot there, and it was for that purpose that the amendment was suggested by the committee.

Mr. GOSSETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I have been thinking the matter over and I came to the conclusion that someone ought to indicate about what will be involved in this situation of disposing of this surplus property. Any property that the Government has and does not want is surplus Government property. At the conclusion of this war, according to the best estimate that I can read on the subject, there will be \$60,000,000,000 of investment in this property. Of this sixty billion, three-quarters of it, or forty-five billion, will be retained by the Army in our national defense. That leaves fifteen billion. Of this fifteen billion, \$9,000,000,000 of that property is in Europe, leaving six billion for us to handle here at home.

Just what does it consist of? What will they sell to you? First, they will sell raw materials that the Government does not need and does not want: Aluminum, copper, steel, zinc, rope, lumber, and so forth; second, motor vehicles, trucks, and jeeps; third, clothing, footwear, blankets, bedding, utensils, and so forth; fourth, obsolete combat equipment. That is what they are going to sell, and there will be about \$5,000,000,000 worth involved. I notice here this afternoon

some of us are apprehensive that this property will not be disposed of in a fair way; that there is no earmark of fairness that can be established.

I call your attention to page 32 of the bill, where section 11 provides:

In formulating regulations to govern the care and handling and disposition of surplus property under this act, the administrator shall be guided by the objectives stated in section 1 of this act, and shall give effect to the following policies to the extent feasible, and in the public interest.

He is guided by two rules of action, first in the preamble and second in the specific manner. On page 33 we have that specific manner, as far as we are concerned, about small business, which you are anxious to know about:

To afford smaller business concerns, farmers, and agricultural enterprises generally an opportunity to acquire surplus property on equal terms with larger competitors—

You could not get anything more fair than that. If a small dealer in my county wants to buy 4 tractors, under the terms of this bill and under the terms under which these regulations shall be written, he will be entitled to buy 4 tractors at the same rate as one who might buy 100—

to provide as far as practicable for uniform and wide public notice concerning surplus property available for disposition—

And further—

to discourage disposition to speculators.

Those rules and regulations must be written under the terms of those provisions, first in section 1 of the bill and then in section 11.

This is the point that impresses me. On page 34 it states:

To prevent insofar as possible unusual and excessive profits being made out of surplus property.

This means first in the sale to the dealer, and second, that after the dealer gets possession of it he is guided by the same principle.

I think this committee has gone about as far as it can in writing specific measures to handle the entire situation. It seems to me it has riveted it down so that anyone could appear where a sale was made where it was apparent on the face of it that the profit was unconscionable and unreasonable, and I do not think they would have a leg to stand on under the terms of this bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I wish to compliment the gentleman and the rest of the committee on this bill. There is one thing, however, that I should like to hear discussed by someone who is competent along that line, and that is the decision to appoint an administrator rather than a five-, seven-, or nine-man board, which might have as part of its representation members from heavy industry, from merchandising, and possibly to represent the consumer's interest, to set up these policy regulations. Would the gentleman care to discuss why an administrator was chosen rather than a board?

Mr. BURDICK. I think where you have too much scattered responsibility you have none at all. I want that responsibility put right where we can handle it, and under the terms of this bill that responsibility is fixed.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I congratulate the gentleman on his thoughtful, careful, and constructive statement. May I say that in the handling of this surplus property there are many items that are urgently needed by the public, because there is a scarcity, as he so well points out. The aggregate of disposals in retail sales in the United States is around \$1,000,000,000 per month, and we will provide approximately \$6,000,000,000. That might be kept in mind when we manifest our apprehension, keeping in mind that this bill will not disrupt our economy but provide for objectives that are sorely needed by many of our people now.

Mr. BURDICK. That takes the place of less than 2 months' production.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Absolutely.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. IZAC. Does the gentleman recognize in the bill at any point any statement to the effect that we shall distribute these surplus commodities by small units rather than large?

Mr. BURDICK. No; all it says is:

To afford smaller business concerns, farmers, and agricultural enterprises generally an opportunity to acquire surplus property on equal terms with larger competitors.

Mr. IZAC. However, there is nothing to prevent a great accumulation of surpluses being disposed of to one corporation?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi to answer that question.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In the first place, there are very stringent prohibitions against monopoly and the prevention of competition, and, second, the objective as to use, as stated by the gentleman in his original statement, is to foster wide distribution of surplus property.

Mr. BURDICK. Further answering the gentleman from California, I think there is some merit in what he questions. The fact that the bill lays down the formula that property shall be sold on equal terms with larger competitors would not have much effect if you did not have the money to go through with it.

Mr. IZAC. That is correct. Furthermore, we had the experience in the First World War that that is exactly what happened. We had JP-4's turned back to the Curtis Co. for \$450 apiece, and that company then sold them to the aviators who came back for \$4,600 apiece.

Mr. BURDICK. I think this bill prevents that.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I hope the gentleman is correct. It does not seem to me that the bill is strong enough on the point just raised by my friend from California, and I propose to offer an amendment which will state that the administrator shall dispose of property in the smallest practicable lots, which seems to me to be an understandable and possible thing to do. I cannot see why it will not protect against the situation the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. IZAC. If the gentleman will yield further, I have this further suggestion. The Committee on Naval Affairs sat for about 2 months on this very subject, and we were unable to find a way to prevent excessive profits. We did discuss this feature which I should like to offer as an amendment, although I admit that it is full of loopholes. I should like to see a limitation on the mark-up from the original price placed on the further disposal of all materials obtained under this bill, for instance, a mark-up limitation of 40 percent. If you will do that, you will keep the speculators from getting any of this material.

Mr. BURDICK. I will confess in discussing this bill that I must agree with both gentlemen from California, because I have the same thing in mind.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If the gentleman will yield further, in carrying out that policy we will be running up against the continuation of Price Administration, regimentation and control long after it is needed, if it is invoked.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. May I make this further comment: I was in the merchandising business after the last war and found it was impossible to go into the market and bid on lots of shoes, say, because some man had bought five carloads of shoes at 14 cents a pair and the little man could not step in and bid. Unless there is some provision made in this bill that in the regulations written by the administrator there is a provision that once a price has been placed on a certain article individual purchasers or small-lot purchasers are given the first chance at it, I doubt very much if you will prevent the concentration of this material in the hands of the big dealers.

Mr. BURDICK. We have heard very much in this Congress about the protection of small business. It seems to me we can carry out the general purpose of this bill and vote for it and still insert in the bill those provisions that will actually help small business. Here is a chance to do it.

I compliment both gentlemen from California on making that suggestion. I think the committee sees the point. This is a place where you can absolutely give small business an equal chance, that is needed, and up to date they have not had it.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, the only reason I am taking some time now is because there is no one else who has asked for time at this moment. I understand the reason for that is that Members on our side have amendments they would like to offer to this bill and they

are waiting for the time when amendments are to be offered in order to address the House on their amendments. This bill, of course, creates a czar to handle the disposition of surplus commodities. It has been estimated that from \$40,000,000,000 to \$125,000,000,000 worth of properties will be disposed of by this czar.

Mr. ROLPH. The gentleman speaks about the total amount of property that is to be disposed of under this bill. Does the gentleman know if any inventory has been made? Does the gentleman know if any accurate inventory has ever been made of merchandise that will be handled under this legislation?

Mr. BENDER. Frankly, there have been estimates made by those who are in a position to know, estimates as to the amount, and you will find that contained in the hearings.

Mr. ROLPH. Is there an inventory?

Mr. BENDER. There is not exactly an inventory, but there are estimates made by the gentleman who has been suggested as the possible administrator under this bill. Mr. Clayton, as well as Mr. Folsom, treasurer of the Eastman Kodak Co., who has been studying this problem, as well as another gentleman who has written a book recently and who has given us some figures. But they are all guessing, more or less, as to the total surplus there will be, because no one knows how long the war will last and no one knows when property will become surplus. We have gone along in this war, and this Congress has been very generous in voting money for all the departments engaged in the war effort and has voted limitless sums of money to both the War and Navy Departments and all the other departments in the name of the war effort. I am sure this money, in some instances, has not been well spent. I know in Cleveland, for example, we have a branch of the Navy, an accounts department, and I know that in that accounts department they could get along with about half the personnel. I have that information from people who are competent to judge. However, with the war on there is not a Member of Congress who is willing to get up here and criticize because we are anxious to vote every cent to speed the winning of the war.

But here we have something else. Here is something that deals with the property of the United States Government, of the taxpayers, after the war. Many Members on both sides of the aisle today and last week have questioned this proposal. Well, all I can say to them is this: I am willing and anxious to vote for the best plan, and if you have a proposal better than this one, in the name of good government, get up here and offer it. We are here, even as members of this committee, with open minds. During the hearings on this bill there has been very little debate. There has not been enough advice and counsel offered by the citizens to the Congress. There has not been enough contributed in the way of expert advice on this issue. This measure involves approximately \$75,000,000,000. You can appreciate how our whole economy will be affected if \$75,000,000,000 worth of material, or

even one-fourth of that, is thrown on the market and upsets the apple cart as far as our whole economy is concerned. The question has been raised as to who will administer this law. I do not know. It has been mentioned here that Mr. Clayton will be the administrator, and high tribute has been paid to him. I have heard, on the other hand, that Maury Maverick, whom I do not know personally, might be the administrator. I cannot say anything regarding him. I have heard that Harry Hopkins might be the administrator. I have even heard that Vice President WALLACE might be the administrator and might have to do with the disposal of the property. I question the wisdom of voting to give that man a 2-year tenure in office at this time, especially since we are going into a national election and when the prospects are very good that our national administration will change next January.

Possibly the Congress can suggest some alternate plan. After all, I know that on the floor of Congress we voted on and discussed issues regarding the O. P. A. Only this morning I had a long-distance call from a man who sold a refrigerator to a friend. He sold only one refrigerator to his friend and he was fined \$542. I am sure, as a Member of Congress, I never intended that the O. P. A. should have the power to make such an assessment against an individual in the sale of one refrigerator. Here we have millions of jeeps and millions of acres of land and thousands of ships. We have everything from soup to nuts to sell under this bill and we are giving the authority to one man. I am anxious to vote for a bill and if there is no better way out I will vote for this one. However, if you have any question in your mind regarding this proposition you should raise that question even if we work here for 4 or 5 days. We will not lose anything. We will all profit if you offer constructive amendments to this measure, and if you offer the benefit of your advice and your experience at this time regarding this legislation.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am much obliged to the gentleman, because I agree with him. While I think the committee did a very conscientious job, I do believe we can be more specific in a number of instances in this matter and I am hoping to have the time in just a few minutes to discuss some of those things.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. I agree with what the gentleman has said. I want to call to his attention and to the attention of the House this fact, that 2 days' general discussion has been provided for speeches just like the one the gentleman has made. Then there is no limit on the time that will be given in the House, under the 5-minute rule, to offer every amendment

that any Member of the House feels should be considered, and there will be a vote on that. So that here is an opportunity for full and free expression of the House to write its own legislation and work its own will in reference to the property here covered.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] who is a member of the Rules Committee. I appreciate the fact that he had that in mind when this rule was presented.

Now, there is some excuse for some of the appropriation bills for the Army and the Navy going through here like a cat goes through a dog show, but there is absolutely no excuse for this bill dealing in seventy-five to one hundred billion dollars worth of commodities and effecting the economy of the United States as this bill affects our economy, getting the bum's rush. Now it is something to which all of us should give the best we have in the way of experience—experience in our home communities. For example, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] appeared before the committee this morning in connection with a problem affecting his district. He was discussing pipe lines. He said there was only one customer for this pipe line and that was I believe, some gas company, and if that gas company got control of that pipe line, the whole anthracite industry in the State of Pennsylvania will be affected and thousands of men will be unemployed as the result of the sale of that equipment to that one customer or to that one prospective buyer who is in the market to make that purchase. In my opinion that is something that ought to receive the serious consideration of this House and we ought to take time to discuss it and discuss it fully and freely.

I receive a great deal of mail. In fact, I was told by the postmaster that I receive more mail than any other Member of the House, but I am sorry to say I have received only a handful of letters from my constituents and your constituents regarding this proposition. It may be that most of them do not know it is here. Maybe they are thinking about the war and not thinking about post-war problems and the disposal of this property. But we are here specifically today and this week to consider and to discuss this measure. Do not be hurried. Take your time. I hope that all of us will give this matter the serious and careful consideration it deserves.

Even though I voted to report this bill out, even though I feel that our committee endeavored to do the best job possible, I still feel there is room for improvement. I hope that everyone of you will make your contribution and if you have any question in your mind whatsoever regarding any provision of this bill you will state it here on the floor.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With respect to the disposal of the pipe line, as disclosed by the hearings, is it not true that the committee reporting this bill undertook

to get all the information it could with respect to any restrictions or any language that the committee could use in the disposal of that sort of property or any other plant that the Government might have operated during the war?

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is correct regarding that particular pipe line, but the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] came in at the eleventh hour, when we were ready to adjourn. He came in at a time when we were ready to report the bill out. Fortunately for him, his amendment was adopted as a part of the committee report. I believe I am correct in that. I am pleased that the gentleman was there and represented his constituency as well as he did. Even though the gentleman was on the committee that presented the bill to us before, the gentleman afterward considered this proposition that vitally affected his district, which indicates to me that there must be many, many other similar items.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has expired.

Mr. HALE. I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BENDER. There must be many other items that deserve the same kind of consideration that the gentleman's amendment received?

Mr. WALTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that I did not learn there was somebody interested in this pipe line, insofar as it could be used in competition with the great anthracite industry, until I read a speech recently delivered by one of the vice presidents of the Standard Oil Co. of Ohio. That speech indicated the use to which this pipe line could be put. I learned thereafter that there is only one company in the Nation that could possibly undertake the use of this facility, and that is one of the Standard Oil companies.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The report does not include the gentleman's suggested amendment. As a matter of fact, it was adopted by the committee today. The report was filed yesterday.

Mr. BENDER. I commend the gentleman for offering his amendment, irrespective of whether it is Company A or Company Z. Irrespective of who is affected, the fact that there is such a condition ought to be carefully considered by the Congress.

When you vote power to some of these bureaucrats, believe me they will use every ounce of power you give them. It is not a matter of a lot of pious phrases as one gentleman this morning referred to much of the language in the bill. He said: "There are a lot of pious phrases." That is where the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] got that word "pious." He heard it this morning in committee. The thing is loaded with pious phrases that do not mean a thing. Just words. Now, it is up to you and up

to me to find out where the pious phrases are, and separate the wheat from the chaff, and actually determine what the meat in the coconut is, and then act accordingly. But I know if you give some of these people power they will use every ounce of it. In fact I have known in recent years of these bureaucrats going back as far as the Civil War to get more power and authority, and if these same minds are in the driver's seat, God help the people of America.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that this bill was loaded with pious words and meaningless phrases, and yet I understood the gentleman to say a while ago that he voted to report this bill out?

Mr. BENDER. I voted to report out all the pious words. Frankly I voted for this bill because I wanted the bill to come to the floor of this House. I felt it was the best thing we had to give in the absence of anything else. At the same time I wanted to give an opportunity to the membership to present amendments. I expect to be here and listen to every amendment and to vote even as a member of the committee which reported this bill out, for desirable amendments. The word "pious" is not my own. That is in quotation marks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. May I say I am a member of the so-called Post-war Economic Policy Committee which was called back here to sit with your committee to consider this bill. After laborious effort I arrived here on last Monday and I sat with the committee until it concluded hearings. I understood the committee had heard all the witnesses they desired to hear, and that the committee was ready to consider this bill. If this bill is in a terrible shape as the gentleman has indicated, I just cannot understand how it got to the floor of this House and why that committee did not write a sane bill without pious words and meaningless phrases, and then bring it to the floor of the House to be written on the floor, a think we all know cannot be done.

Mr. BENDER. I did not say this was a terrible bill, but I do not want this to be a terrible bill; I want this to be a good bill.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. What does the gentleman call it?

Mr. BENDER. Just a moment. There is the question as to who is to administer this law. Three or four names have been advanced. If there is a question as to the power this individual is vested with it should be raised and discussed now. I repeat again, we now have this matter before us; let us use this opportunity to act wisely and intelligently. Perhaps the legislation is drawn in the best possible language. I hope so. If we pass this bill as it is I hope it is right because

I helped bring it to the floor by voting for it. But before I finally vote on the bill I want to be certain of what I am doing. I do not pretend to know all the answers. I do not know very many of the answers. There are men here with all kinds of experience in other fields than mine. Let them give us the benefit of their advice and their experience. At the hearings we held last week unfortunately only half a dozen people appeared before the committee. I attended some of the hearings; some I did not, but I read every word of the hearings and there were not over half a dozen expert witnesses who appeared before the committee.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman has talked about the possible administrator of this bill. It seems to me we are confronted with the same situation in this bill that we were when we brought before the House and passed the war-contracts-termination bill which is now the law. We all know somebody has to be clothed with authority to do this big job and to do this big job in a speedy, efficient way; that is just what this bill seeks to do.

I warn you that if you go to limiting the power and authority of the man who is to do this job you are going to thwart the very purposes of this legislation which we are told is so badly needed or will be when this unfortunate war ends. I want to sound the warning at this time that if we follow some of the gentleman's suggestions I am afraid we shall wreck the bill that was drawn to do the job.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. Yes; I yield, but I want to reply to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have no desire to cut the gentleman off from answering, and I am sure I could not if I would. With respect to the hearings, is it not true that the Committee on Expenditures, of which the gentleman himself is a member, gave consideration to the matter of surplus property for weeks and for months, having begun consideration of the subject in February 1943, and finally reporting a bill here that was passed by the House on June 9 and that those hearings are available? Is it not true that we had before us in executive, as well as open session, whose testimony in open session is published in the hearings, representatives from the various agencies of the Government? Is it not also true that, in addition to the hearings conducted by the Committee on Expenditures, the hearings conducted before the Committee on Public Buildings and Lands, the Committee on Small Business, the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House, and in addition to that, the hearings conducted before the Military Affairs Committee in the Senate, and other committees, all having to do with the question of surplus property, were available to members of this committee and are available to Members of the House?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Ohio 10 additional minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Answering the question regarding the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, dealing with surplus commodities last year, that bill is as dead as a dodo bird; it is in the ashcan. Is that not true?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But the fact is that we considered the subject matter of surplus property extensively and comprehensively for months last year.

Mr. BENDER. We did discuss and consider surplus commodities, but we did not discuss and consider all the issues involved, and not one of us had in mind the tremendous sums that are now before us as surplus. We, however, passed a bill; but I ask the gentleman to compare that bill with this one and he will see that the phraseology is as different as night is from day, that the whole plan and program is different than that which we acted on before. Is not that true?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The purpose of my question, of course, was to emphasize the fact that this bill was not hastily considered but that the subject matter, especially the subject matter of surplus property, had been considered off and on for 18 or 20 months and by many other committees of the Congress, and that their hearings were available to the members of our committee as well as to the Members of Congress when we reported this bill.

Mr. BENDER. I do not know why some of the Members are so touchy about openly and freely considering this question. That is what I am apprehensive about. I am concerned that we make as few mistakes as possible. I am sure the gentleman is a conscientious Member of the committee. I have great respect for the gentleman, I have great respect for his ability, I have great respect for his contribution to the hearings; but the gentleman is aware of the fact that we have at times passed legislation quickly, that at the last moment amendments are offered that even the gentleman with all his experience never thought about.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I had in mind the gentleman's initial statement. He said he was trying to consume time and I merely wanted to help him.

Mr. BENDER. No one consumes more time in the House on all occasions than does the gentleman from Mississippi. I think I have spoken on this floor only a few times in the last 2 or 3 years.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I was just trying to help the gentleman.

Mr. BENDER. I do not propose to be censured by the gentleman from Mississippi who speaks longer and louder on every subject than most Members.

Most of my experience in business was that of a department-store executive. I know how easy it is to get surplus prop-

erty on your shelves; I know how easy it is to lose money in the mercantile business if you are not on your toes. The gentleman back there is in the same kind of business and I notice that he nods his head. He understands what I am trying to say here. When you have \$75,000,000,000 worth of surplus property, it behooves all of us to watch our step.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. Since the gentleman referred to me, I would like to ask him a question to clear my own mind. How are you going to put a man in charge of the sale of surplus property, a single man, then in section 7 by five short sentences turn over the sale of surplus property to individuals, or I may say divisions of the Federal Government and all this man has to do is be subject to the regulations of the administrator with respect to price regulation? Here is what I would like to know. Price regulation has nothing to do with sale regulation. There is all the difference in the world. All the price administrator has to do with any of this property listed on page 29 is through price regulation. Price regulation does not mean a snap of your finger if you do not add sale regulations. I want to know who is going to sell it, how he is going to sell it, how you are going to dispose of it? I heard a story when I was home in regard to the sale of blankets. No one could bid on them unless he could bid on 500,000.

Mr. BENDER. I originally asked for 15 minutes and I consumed part of that time when questions were asked. If I tried to answer the gentleman's question I would require an hour's time to discuss that one point alone.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do I now understand that all employees employed by the administrator will be subject to civil-service rules, regulations, and standards?

Mr. CHURCH. The regular employees, but not the specialists.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Oh, well, now, that is different.

Mr. CHURCH. It is just like any other branch or any other agency. The stenographers, clerks, and so forth, are under the civil service. The bill was corrected in that respect. The specialists are not under civil service.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to make one further statement.

Mr. CHURCH. The regular employees will be under the civil service.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We are entering into what I understand will be the greatest merchandising job ever created for one single organization. Now, merchandising is a rather special field, and I am talking about merchandising now. You go out and merchandise a proposition. What percentage of the total of these employees will be specialists?

Mr. CHURCH. Would the gentleman want those specialist merchandisers to be under the civil service?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No.

Mr. CHURCH. Then this bill takes care of the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to have the RECORD show whether or not these employees are subject to civil service and if they are not subject to civil service let us have the RECORD show that fact. If they are subject to civil service, or only a part of them, what is the percentage; and if the others are exempt, what percentage? That is the type of information the country wants.

Mr. CHURCH. Would not the gentleman be willing to leave it to the administrator to determine the number of specialists he needs and have the regular stenographers, clerks, and so forth, as usual in the departments, under the civil service?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Undoubtedly to be practical that is the way you will have to do it.

Mr. MANASCO. If the gentleman will yield, in answer to the question asked by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], the surplus property administrator himself does not dispose of the property directly. That is being done by the different operating agencies. The employees of those operating agencies are all under the civil service now.

Mr. HILL. I do not like the gentleman to pass my question with a brush on the shoulder because I am talking about a fundamental here. I am talking about the sale of goods and the price of goods. I could not bid on 500,000 blankets if I were a small businessman but I might be able to bid on a hundred blankets.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HILL. This is a price arrangement. I want a sales plan worked out. You will notice on page 29 these words:

Any property which is damaged or worn beyond economical repair.

That is not pious language so far as I am concerned. A piece of equipment might be worn beyond economical repair for something I wish to use it for but it would be the very identical piece of equipment in that shape for someone else to use. How are you going to interpret such loose language?

Then there is the next line:

Any waste, salvage, scrap, or other similar items.

Every one of those items can be sold by the organization or department that has them and all the administrator has to say is: "Go ahead if the price is right," not the sale. I object to that kind of language and I say to you as a businessman that phrase means nothing.

Mr. MANASCO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. That is the section that provides "any waste, salvage, scrap, or other similar items." We found if you tried to limit the construction of that, there might be so much slop or garbage

on hand at an Army camp that would be very bad for the health of the Army camp and they could not dispose of it. We had to provide that way. Now, refer to page 32, subsection (c) of section 10, which reads:

The administrator, by regulation, shall prescribe such policies governing prices and other terms and conditions of dispositions under the authority of subsections (a) and (b) of this section, as he deems necessary to effectuate the objectives and policies of this act.

I think that would take care of the price situation and it would also take care of the problem of the small businessmen in purchasing in smaller lots.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON], a member of the committee, has an amendment creating an advisory council, that he expects to offer when amendments are in order. It will be noted in the bill itself that an advisory council is created to be made up of the cabinet members of the administration then in power. It will be noted also that the Congress is to be the watchdog, a quarterly report to be made by the administrator to the Congress, giving an account of his stewardship.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Without pretending to be facetious and in all seriousness, if the gentleman will permit, this section 7 was discussed by the committee and rather carefully analyzed. It is essential to enable an Army camp to dispose of garbage, for instance, that has to be disposed of immediately. That should not be handled by the administrator. That should be handled by the camp. Section 3, for example, we were advised, is essential; otherwise the administrator might have the authority to dispose of the power at Muscle Shoals. That is the purpose for which Muscle Shoals exists. This language here with respect to property that is damaged or worn beyond economical repair perhaps could be improved upon, and if it can be improved upon, I would like to have the language. I have a high regard for the gentleman from Colorado and for his views, and may I say to him that language is not original to this bill. It undertakes to except property that had no value; it undertakes to except property that has to be disposed of at once and it undertakes to except property that is within the functions of the agency, as the language is used in the particular section.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HILL. The language I am objecting to is not in sections 1, 2, 3, and 4. I object to the word "price" in the second line. It reads:

Subject only to the regulations of the administrator with respect to price policy.

I object to that because it is absolutely wrong. If you are just going to give him price policies on the sale of those products, you have no regulatory control over the administrator in the sale of them. If the price is O. K., that is all there is to it, but that is not the way we want to dispose of them.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us refer to page 32, section 11:

Sec. 11. In formulating regulations to govern the care and handling and disposition of surplus property under this act, the Administrator shall be guided by the objectives stated in section 1 of this act, and shall give effect to the following policies to the extent feasible, and in the public interest:

This is the question I wish to ask the chairman of the committee. Going on over to page 33, if the chairman of the committee will listen to me, lines 13 to 24, inclusive, what is there in section 11, page 32, lines 19 to 23, which makes it mandatory that the administrator shall give smaller business concerns, farmers, and agricultural enterprises generally an opportunity to acquire surplus property on equal terms with larger competitors?

Mr. MANASCO. There is nothing mandatory.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, this bill does not put the farmers or the small business concerns on an equal basis with large competitors; does it?

Mr. MANASCO. This is merely a ruling guide to the administrator.

Mr. CRAWFORD. A ruling what?

Mr. MANASCO. A ruling guide to the administrator. If he carries out his duties, he will follow this.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would just like to say that I have an amendment that will make it mandatory, which I hope to explain just as soon as I get a chance to speak.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BENDER. I hope that during this discussion some additional knowledge and information has come to the Members, which will be valuable to them as we vote on this bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. May I ask the gentleman what the language on lines 13 and 14, page 38, means, which reads as follows:

And for completion of any semifabricated property.

This section authorizes the Government agency to go ahead and take care of property or to complete any semifabricated property. What are the limitations to what it can do? Can it go ahead and assemble machines that there are ample parts for already manufactured? If so, many of these Government factories could run on for a long time.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MANASCO. That provision was put in there because in the termination of war contracts you might find yourself with rayon hose or underwear, as examples, almost finished, yet if they were not finished, they would be an economic waste to the taxpayer of the

United States. This authorizes the completion of those goods so that they can be marketed.

Mr. CURTIS. Is there any time limit in which they must be completed?

Mr. MANASCO. No time limit.

Mr. CURTIS. Any time during the life of this bill they can go ahead and complete the manufacture of property that is in the process of being manufactured at the present time or after the war is over.

Mr. MANASCO. I do not think the private contractor would allow unfinished undershirts to stay in the machine. They would have to be finished completely.

Mr. CURTIS. That also applies to other things?

Mr. MANASCO. That is true.

Mr. CURTIS. Such as steel products, and everything else.

Mr. MANASCO. That is true.

Mr. CURTIS. It occurs to me that there should be some limitation on how far they can go.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, this Congress is considering today important legislation to provide for disposal of surplus Government property and plants. The bill concerns the post-war period and may well affect the economy of our country. It deals with huge amounts of materials and equipment and war plants which will be disposed of to the general public from Government stocks. Even now the Army has surpluses of materials and equipment which are awaiting disposition. We must be careful to see that this material is disposed of where it is needed most and in a manner most advantageous to the Government.

The people of this Nation who are bearing the greatest burdens of taxation look to the Members of the Congress to place limitations in this legislation which will obtain a maximum of return and a maximum of benefit to the Government in the disposition of this property. My constituents have expressed concern lest this property fall into the hands of speculators. They request that the utmost care be taken in the formulation of plans and policies for the disposal of these goods. They suggest that the Government make proper provisions to make available to agriculture all of the equipment that is suitable for agriculture, and that such other material and equipment suitable for airports, road construction, schools, hospitals, and public works of all kinds be made available through a suitable post-war public works program.

My constituents urge that the office to be established under the terms of this legislation be required to set up the necessary machinery in the States and local communities for the disposition of this property and equipment locally and as soon as practicable. I recommend immediate action on this legislation which is urgently needed for the prompt, fair, and efficient disposal of surplus Government property and plants, and hope the bill will be amended to meet these requirements.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, this morning the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], in his remarks, stated that the Congress was not slow about passing this legislation, but that as a matter of fact it had passed it just as soon as the recommendation came up from the executive who is now in charge of this program. That is, of course, true.

But there are two things I want to say by way of introduction of my remarks this afternoon. Both of them have to do with the position of the Congress in our National Government and in the minds of the people of the Nation. Because I believe that the problems of government after this war are going to be more difficult than they have ever been before, and because I believe most earnestly that the future of human liberty depends upon the preservation in all its verity of democratic government, therefore I think there are two things that the Congress must do. The first is to take such action as may be necessary in the interest of the Nation before, not after, Executive action has to be taken, in the absence of such congressional action. The second is that whenever the Congress sets up an agency of government with certain powers or certain duties, it should go just as far as it is humanly possible for it to go in passing a genuine piece of legislation in laying down, insofar as it possibly can, the precise manner in which that job is to be done, the precise powers to be exercised, and the precise means of accomplishing the objectives which are set before the agency.

In the instant bill, as far as the objectives stated by the committee in the language of this bill are concerned, I have no possible quarrel with those objectives. I was present at a good many of the hearings and heard a portion of Mr. Clayton's testimony. I recognize the difficulties that inhere in some of the provisions which some of us would like to see which would tighten up the bill, but there are other such provisions which I do not believe would harm the bill in any way but would on the contrary make it a much better piece of legislation and about which I am going to speak in just a moment.

May I say further by way of introduction that I have just come back from home about a week ago. I believe in all sincerity that the city of Washington generally is, compared to the United States of America, in a sort of intellectual backwash. I found that the people in my home district were, in the progressiveness of their thinking, vastly advanced over the general point of view that one finds in discussions around this National Capital. I hope the Congress will realize that fact, because the people really mean it when they say they expect us not just to talk about making a lasting peace, not just to talk about preparing such a program as will prevent any period of unemployment after this war,

but they want those things to really be done.

As to the bill before us, I should like to contrast the idea that we have to give vast, discretionary power to this administrator over this surplus-property-disposal job with the manner in which the House legislated on some other propositions. We recently passed the O. P. A. bill, and that job is at least as complex as this job, if not a more complex job than this one, though perhaps no more important. Nonetheless we provided all kinds of restrictions about the power of the O. P. A. Administrator. We wrote into that bill a great many very specific things that had to be done and the way in which they had to be done, and a lot of us voted for those things. I believe we passed a pretty good bill. So with those few thoughts in mind I should like to go forward now with brief comments on this bill.

Section 1 sets forth objectives to be accomplished. I have said I do not think they could be better stated, and I personally think they are quite complete. I think they cover the ground. I think that is the kind of program we want to see for the disposal of surplus property.

The second section has to do with definitions, and I have no comment on that.

In the third section we come to the surplus property administrator. I am frank to say that I think the one thing that is needed to save this program more than anything else is to keep it as close to the American people as possible. I introduced a bill about this matter myself, House bill 5082, which I discussed briefly when I had an opportunity to appear before the committee. In that bill I had a provision for a civilian board to oversee this work and to see that the policies laid down by Congress were adhered to. I had a proposal also that the board in turn appoint State boards of outstanding citizens in the various States to guide the disposal work in those States and to see to it that as to each State there was equitable distribution of an equitable share of this surplus property in that State. I expect it will be said that that is an impractical proposition. I do not believe it is. I think it could be done that way, and I think the job is big enough so that it would be worth while to try to get as much representation from among the American people into the conduct of this work as you can possibly get.

There is a surplus property advisory board provided in the bill. I think that board is probably necessary. It consists of the heads of various Government departments and agencies, but it does not take the place of the type of citizens' board which I have mentioned.

On page 30, in section 8, I come to the first main point I should like to make. I mentioned this morning in interrogation of the able chairman of this committee the fact that I believed that a mistake had been made in assigning to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the job of disposing of agricultural lands. It just does not seem to me it is part of the job of the Reconstruction Finance Cor-

poration to do that. Clearly it should be done by the Department of Agriculture, which, after all, is much more familiar with farming problems. It administers the program of the tenant purchase loans, and it administers the Farm Credit Administration and all the rest of the agricultural programs.

I would personally like to see an amendment put on this bill to say that agricultural lands shall be handled by the Department of Agriculture or, better yet, to say that in the designation of Government agencies to act as disposal agencies under this act, the Administrator shall make that designation and submit it to Congress, and that it shall become effective unless amended or disapproved by Congress within say 30 days. We have done that before on other types of bills. I should like to have something to say about what agencies are named here, because I think it is important, and I think that what happened in the case of these agricultural lands is illustrative of its importance.

I take it that section 10, which begins on page 31 and which is titled "Methods of Disposition," is the section that has to do with the mandatory provisions of the bill, and that section 11 is the section which has to do with the policy provisions of the bill. So, because I believe there are certain things which ought to be made mandatory instead of matters of policy, I want to make three suggestions with regard to additional language to be added at the end of section 10, the first of which amendments would read roughly as follows. I am not sure that the language cannot be improved, but generally this is what it would say:

The administrator shall dispose of all surplus property in the smallest practicable lots and shall give preference to purchasers of smaller amounts of property over prospective purchasers of larger amounts.

In other words, if you have a great lot of material to be sold, if you have a whole lot of buildings, for instance, on a piece of land that used to be an Army cantonment or something like that, and there are a lot of folks around that vicinity that want to buy just one building, then they shall have the right to buy one building, and the whole works shall be sold in one-building lots if you can do it. I think that is the policy being pursued by the Corps of Army Engineers at the present time. I know of one instance where I am assured that it is, and I think it ought to be in the bill.

The same thing would be true as to other things. I just had a report given to me—I cannot vouch for this because I do not know it of my own knowledge—that only a day ago a certain individual purchased 10,000 mattresses from the Government. I do not know whether there was no one else who wanted to buy small quantities of mattresses, but I would imagine there are a lot of merchants in this country that would give a great deal if they could get, say, a dozen mattresses in stock.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad the gentleman brought that up, because I have knowledge of that same deal. I understand 100,000 mattresses were offered for disposal right here by the particular department. At least one lot went as 10,000 mattresses. I have concern for the furniture stores of my district that are without mattresses of any kind. I am sure that 50 or 100 mattresses would have been a much better sale unit.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank my able colleague. If the amendment I just read were adopted, I think the administrator would have to sell them in smaller lots if he had any chance to do so.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. Does not every business have its own peculiarities? The gentleman spoke about mattresses. I do not know anything about how mattresses are disposed of, but certainly the minimum quantity that you could sell profitably of a material such as steel, for instance, would be a carload lot. You certainly could not sell some other items in carloads. I think each industry should be given special consideration.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It would have to be. My amendment says that he shall dispose of all surplus property in the smallest practicable lots. I do not think he can sell one steel bar. I do not think any court would so interpret that. I think he could say that it was not practicable to sell one steel bar. Steel is not sold ordinarily in such small amounts.

Mr. ROLPH. Does the gentleman think the carload lot would be the minimum on steel?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would not be surprised in the case of steel but what it would, yes, but I think if you had people bidding for one carload you would have to sell it to those people who wanted one carload before you sold a trainload to somebody.

Mr. ROLPH. But the gentleman would not want to get down to the man who buys one bar or a couple of angles, for instance, because the overhead on that would be excessive.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The reason I put the word "practicable" in there is that I readily recognize the fact that the administrator has to use some discretion about that matter. I think that is a case where he has to do it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That particular thing could be easily taken care of by the insertion of the words "or usual commercial lots."

Mr. VOORHIS of California. In accordance with the customary commercial practice.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. A case of shoes, for instance.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is right.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. Will the gentleman go as far as to say that 10 automobiles or 10 trucks should not be sold to a dealer if they could be sold one by one around town?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. There is language in the bill that states that the administrator is supposed to dispose of the material as far as possible through the customary commercial channels. The committee has written that into the bill. I take it that that language would still be applicable even though my amendment were adopted.

I will answer the gentleman's question a little bit further.

For example, we talked so much about the matter when we passed the G. I. bill, and I do think there are going to be times when returning veterans, or at least some of them, are going to want to go into farming and when I think it would be all right to sell them a truck or a tractor.

I want to go to my next point, which has to do with this first one. I think there also ought to be a requirement contained in a section or a subsection under section 10, which would read approximately as follows:

The administrator shall provide for uniform, complete, and wide public notice concerning surplus property available for distribution and no such property shall be disposed of unless and until such public notice has been given and sufficient time has been allowed between such notice and disposition to afford interested parties a fair opportunity to purchase it.

That is a good deal the same language as the committee has included in section 11, but section 11 is a policy section. I think it ought to be an absolute requirement, and I do not think any surplus property ought to be sold until adequate public notice has been given, because otherwise there will be many, many people throughout the Nation who will not have any chance whatsoever to find out about it.

Now somebody says, "How can the administrator possibly get word to everybody in the country?" Of course, he cannot. But he can develop a regular, uniform, orderly manner of giving notice about these matters. He can make it available to the press. He can post notices in the post offices, and pretty soon the methods used will become well known to everybody. I, myself, believe that as to a good deal of this stuff, you could actually catalog it in a reasonable form and put out that catalog, not having everything in one catalog, but have different booklets for different types of surplus property. In any case, the safety of this whole program depends upon the whole American people knowing exactly what is being done, exactly what is for sale, just how much it was sold for, and for them to know that they have as much chance to buy it as anybody else.

In the next place, I think it would be well to say a little bit more than simply to say that the administrator shall give effect to the policy of affording return-

ing veterans an opportunity to establish themselves as proprietors of agricultural businesses and professional enterprises, and I have wondered whether it was not practical to say that the veteran shall be given preference in the purchase of these commodities, provided that they want to purchase them for use in their own occupation or business. I think thought ought to be given to making that mandatory.

In the next place, I wonder whether it is necessary in section 11, which is the policy section, to say that the administrator shall give effect to the following policies, and I quote, "to the extent feasible and in the public interest." I do not know why we cannot strike out the language "to the extent feasible and in the public interest." We know it is in the public interest for these policies to be followed. Certainly they are stated in sufficiently general terms so that it is not necessary to include the language "to the extent feasible" at least so far as I can see, in connection with that matter.

We already had some discussion this afternoon about another proposal which I was deeply interested in, and that was the question of requiring of the administrator that when he sold property for resale he should at that time fix the maximum resale mark-up that can be charged. I do not see why that cannot be done. I do not believe you can fix one maximum mark-up as to all the different types of surplus property, but I do think the administrator and his staff could do it as to each different lot. I think they could say they will sell this lot of shoes at such-and-such an amount and the maximum amount allowable for a mark-up on those shoes shall be so many percent. I think that would be one way in which we could absolutely guard against the possibility of profiteering in this matter. I do not see why we cannot require that, and I would like to see us do it.

Now, coming to the problem of monopoly, the problem of the disposal of Government plants, which, in many respects, is the most dangerous and critical of all the problems that we are confronted with, for when the war began it was necessary for the procurement divisions of the armed forces to get the stuff for the war and to get it wherever they could get it and to get it as quickly as they could get it. As a consequence, the Government paid billions of dollars for the construction of plants—not at the expense of the companies that used the plants but at the expense of the American taxpayers. Furthermore, a good deal of that money—in fact, most of it—was expended on the construction of plants for companies that were already very big companies in their field and many of which were actual monopolies.

The committee that brings in this bill has recognized that situation insofar as aluminum is concerned and has required that no plants costing more than \$5,000,000, the larger aluminum plants, shall be sold except under certain circumstances and that a report to Congress shall be made first. There are one or two things that I think have to be

done here, because if that be true with reference to aluminum, what about chemicals? I do not know what the facts are about how much public money has been spent on the construction of chemical plants, but I do know there is one corporation which completely dominates the whole chemical business in the United States. Indeed, it has a tighter monopoly, I imagine, than even the Aluminum Corporation of America, and that is the du Pont corporation. I certainly think petroleum ought to be in the same category; I certainly think steel ought to be. I believe aircraft ought to be, and I believe shipbuilding ought to be. In other words, I think what is good for synthetic rubber and aluminum would be good at least for the list of commodities that I have just mentioned.

So far as the disposal of the plant is concerned, a plant built at public expense, the question arises whether it should be turned over or sold to a corporation which already so greatly dominates the field as to fasten a monopoly upon that industry forever by action of the Government. That must not be allowed to happen.

If you do not want to do that, and there has been some argument against it, the chairman of the committee made an able speech about the matter, then I have an alternative proposal because not so long ago, on April 25, 1944, I introduced a bill, H. R. 4668, which is very brief and which I would like to read as a proposed substitute for section 13 of the bill. It reads as follows:

That in the disposal of surplus Government-owned war plants and facilities, the following policies and procedure shall be followed by departments or agencies of government charged with responsibility for such disposal:

(1) In cases where, in the opinion of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, conditions of effective competition exist in the industry in which any plant or facility is to be used, such property shall be disposed of by sale: *Provided, however*, That the Smaller War Plants Corporation shall have the right to exercise a veto power as to any such sale where in its opinion such sale would result in seriously changing the competitive situation in the industry to the disadvantage of small-scale enterprise.

(2) In cases where, in the opinion of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, monopolistic conditions exist in the industry in which any plant or facility would be used then such property shall be disposed of by sale only if it can be sold to such purchaser or purchasers and under such conditions as will in the opinion of the Smaller War Plants Corporation definitely alleviate such monopolistic condition; but wherever the disposal by sale of such plant or facility would result in the opinion of the Smaller War Plants Corporation in aggravating such monopolistic conditions or where the only potential purchaser or purchasers are corporations already exercising monopolistic control in the industry, then until such monopolistic conditions shall have been changed, title to such property shall be retained in the Government and such property shall be leased for operation by private industry at a fair and equitable rental: *Provided*, That all such leases shall contain a clause providing that such lease may be canceled by the Government at any time the plant ceases to be operated at 75 percent or more of ca-

capacity, or monopolistic price policies are in the opinion of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice applied to its product.

In other words, you could not sell the plant for creating additional monopolistic control, but you would have to keep the plant in the technical ownership of the Government and lease it under the terms of the contract which would say, "Yes, you can lease this plant, you can use the plant, but you have got to use it and you cannot say you will just lease it and let it go idle or buy it and junk it, or something like that. You have got to use it for the production of things which the American people need."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMASON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5125) had come to no resolution thereon.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be privileged to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members of the House and of the Nation, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the Appendix of the Record a compilation prepared by the Department of Labor showing employment figures in nonagricultural employment from 1929 to 1943 inclusive;

Second, average weekly pay rolls in manufacturing industries from 1929 to 1943 inclusive;

Third, farmers' net income from 1929 to 1943 inclusive;

And finally, corporation profits, after taxes, from 1929 to 1943 inclusive.

I am sure the Nation will be interested in the story which the figures tell.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mrs. NORTON (at the request of Mr. OUTLAND), for 1 week, on account of official business.

To Mr. VINSON of Georgia (at the request of Mr. RAMSPECK), for an indefinite period, on account of important business.

To Mr. FITZPATRICK (at the request of Mr. WEISS), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the

House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, August 16, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 5185. A bill to provide disability benefits for discharged veterans under certain circumstances; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 5186. A bill to authorize an exchange of lands between the city of Eastport, Maine, and the United States, and the conveyance of a roadway easement to the city of Eastport, Maine; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROLPH:

H. R. 5187. A bill to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 5188. A bill to provide for the control of confidential business data submitted to the War Production Board; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WENE:

H. J. Res. 303. Joint resolution to authorize a preliminary examination of the Delaware River and its tributaries in the Delaware River Basin with a view to devising methods whereby the pollution of the Delaware River and its tributaries would be eliminated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE:

H. R. 5189. A bill for the relief of Capt. Werner Holtz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 5190. A bill for the relief of Charles C. Sidles; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 5191. A bill for the relief of Mr. George Hampton, Pittsburgh, Pa.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5988. By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS: Resolution of the board of commissioners, Borough of Belmar, N. J., urging survey of proposed New Jersey intracoastal waterway from Manasquan River to Shrewsbury River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

5989. By Mr. HOPE: Petition of sundry citizens of Wichita, Kans., urging passage of the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or distribution of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5990. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of sundry citizens of the Twenty-second Congressional District of New York protesting against proposed prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5991. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of board of supervisors, city and county of San Francisco No. 4133, series 1939, petitioning amendment to the Social Security Act to cover employees of a public utility being taken over by the municipality; to the Committee on Ways and Means.